READING ASSOCIATION OF
SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY,
SELINS GROVE, PA.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLVIII.

JANUARY, 1895.

PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE SECOND EMPIRE.

I.—THE INFLUENCE OF THE NAPOLEONIC LEGEND.

BY ALBERT D. VANDAM, AUTHOR OF "AN ENGLISHMAN IN PARIS," "MY PARIS NOTEBOOK," ETC., ETC.

EVER since the fall of the Second Empire at Sedan, historians of the highest attainments like Lanfrey, Taine, and Taxile Delord have been "whittling" the gigantic figure of Napoleon I.; probably with the same intention that prompted Jacob to pill white strakes in the rods of green poplar and hazel and chestnut tree in Laban's field; with this difference, though, that Taine and Lanfrey did not set the whittled Titan before the mentally strongest progenitors of the coming generations, but before the mentally weakest. Lanfrey and Taine have had a kind of reward, notably among French Republicans, who keep yelling that the Napoleonic gods are dead. I, for one, do not believe that the Napoleonic gods are dead. They are wrapt in a deep sleep. Whether we shall see the man with the power to awaken them is another question.

This much concerning the present, let us look at the past, at the period between Waterloo and the overthrow of the dynasty of Louis Philippe, during which period the Napoleonic legend was to France in particular, and to Europe in general, what the stories of the Civil War and the Franco-German Campaign are still, first to Americans and Germans respectively, then to the

Copyright, 1895, by LLOYD BRYCE, All rights reserved.

READING ASSOCIATION OF
SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY,
SELINS GROVE, PA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole of the civilized world : namely, a living, breathing, romantic, and heroic drama upon which the curtain had only fallen a short time since ; a drama most of the actors of which still walked the earth, while its chief hero, like Abraham Lincoln, was already numbered among the immortals of history, by reason of his martyrdom ; a drama from the influence of which even those who had most cause to dread and dispel that influence could not escape. I am quoting from memory, but the reader may rest his mind on that point ; my memory rarely attempts to deceive me without arousing my suspicions to that effect. We have lived for many years on the footing of a jealous husband and wife ; the slightest sign of such deception on its part breeds a corresponding watchfulness on mine, and in this instance I feel absolutely convinced of its faithfulness. Both Generals Cambronne and Drouot had followed Napoleon during the Hundred Days ; the first is credited with having flung a more forcible than elegant monosyllable to his assailants at Waterloo in reply to their summons to surrender ; the second has had his name bestowed on one of the principal streets in Paris. The Bourbons on their return conferred on Cambronne the command of the Lille division ; a frontier post of trust if ever there was one. Drouot retired to his native city, Nancy. Some time afterwards, when the elder son of Charles X. that was to be—the Duc d'Angoulême, who in 1830 abdicated with his father in favor of his nephew the Duc de Bordeaux, subsequently the Comte de Chambord—passed through the capital of Lorraine, he immediately inquired for the residence of Napoleon's favorite general, and called upon him. "*Monsieur le Général,*" said the Prince, "I have come to beg a favor—that of exchanging my sword for yours." Drouot acquiesced, and the son of the House of France carried away the sword as a relic, as a talisman, as a badge of honor.

A few years later the Duc's wife and cousin, the daughter of Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette, the erstwhile prisoner of the Temple, spent a couple of days at Avignon, where at that time there was a branch establishment of the Hôtel des Invalides in Paris. She stayed at the Préfecture, and on the Sunday, as a matter of course, went to Saint Agricol in semi-state. Scarcely had her foot touched the first step leading to the church when the air resounded with the stentorian cry of "*Vive l'Empereur* !" Under the circumstances the cry was considered as nothing less than an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outrage ; the offender was apprehended there and then, and would probably have been rent to death on the spot, for the masses are tigers when they are not apes, and frequently both in one. The offender would have been torn to pieces ; the men who, seven years before then, had inaugurated a series of foul murders with that of Maréchal Brune, would not have scrupled to crown that series with another one, but for the interference of the Duchesse herself and the Prefect. The offender turned out to be a former sergeant in the Imperial Guard with the name of Jean Boucard. An interview took place that same afternoon between the veteran of *la Grande Armée* and the presumptive Queen of France, at which no one was present but the Prefect, who afterwards told the story to one of my relatives.* That story is, however, too long to be given in full here. For the first time in her life, perhaps, the daughter of the Bourbons found herself face to face with an eyewitness of that marvellous Napoleonic era whom no considerations of courtly etiquette prevented from limning it in all its brilliant, glowing colors, as well as in all its sombre and tragic incidents, for Jean Boucard had been rendered childless by the god he adored ; his eldest son had been killed at Leipzig, his younger at Waterloo.

"Ah, you see, M. Boucard," said the Princess when the veteran came to that part of his story ; "we cause the death of no one."

"Pardon me, Madame," interrupted Boucard, "you had some one killed who was dearer to me than both my sons ; you killed my general, my marshal, you killed Michel Ney."

In spite of this rough reminder of the crime of her uncle (Louis XVIII.), the Princess endeavored to convert Jean Boucard to the existing *régime,* nay, fancied she had converted him, for he accepted a generous bounty for himself and his widowed sister. But Boucard was not converted, though he also construed his acceptance of the Princess's subsidy in that spirit, and felt remorse gnawing at his heart in consequence. He no longer held up his head, shunned his fellow-veterans, and from an occasional tippler became a confirmed drunkard. During those drunken fits he was silently arrogant, staring his former comrades in the face, evidently bent on pro-

* For an account of those relatives and their influence upon me as a writer, I must refer my readers to *My Paris Notebook.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

voking them. On one occasion he told the Prefect that he would like to earn the money that had been given to him by killing one of them. "The gold bears the blood-marks of the murdered Michel Ney," he said. "I have tried to wash it clean in wine; only more blood will do it." Time went by, and the birthday of Louis XVIII. came round. On that morning Boucard was more helplessly drunk and more defiant than usual. He loudly announced his intention of drinking the King's health at the dinner given on that occasion. He tried to be as good as his word, but the "*Vive le Roi*" stuck in his throat. Then, with a supreme effort, he gasped "*Vive l'Empereur!*" and dropped to the floor. When they picked him up he was dead.

I might fill a book with stories of the unalterable devotion of those veterans to the memory of the leader for whom they had shed their blood. One more must suffice.

After his coronation, Charles X. was about to enter the archbishop's palace at Rheims when he noticed an old man, minus one arm, who stood quietly smoking his pipe, profoundly indifferent to the ceremony which had just concluded, and not bestowing as much as a glance on the newly crowned king. Though the man wore no uniform, the martial air was unmistakable; it was only emphasized by the absence of the limb. The sovereign stopped on the threshold of the palace, and sent an aide-de-camp for the apathetic veteran who came immediately, with his pipe still alight in his hand.

"That pipe seems a great comfort to you, friend," said the King, breaking the ice at once.

"It is a comfort," replied the old soldier, pointedly; "it compensates for many things."

"Which means," retorted the King, "that you are not too well pleased to-day?"

"I am aware, Sire," was the instantaneous rejoinder, "that in Rheims to-day every one is well pleased; I, unfortunately, am unable to take my share in the rejoicings."

"And why?" queried the King.

"Because I remember too well another coronation in which I took my humble part."

Charles X. was not easily disconcerted; he had a ready wit. "That's right," he said; "we should never forget those who led us to victory. But why are you not at the Invalides?"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Because I prefer to eat my crust at home in my own country. I am satisfied to live on the pension my cross [of the Legion of Honor] brings me."

"The Invalides is your home by right; it is not a question of charity," remarked the King, still bent on conciliating the old soldier, and bowing to him.

The veteran stood at the salute until Charles X. had disappeared, then went back quietly to his sunny spot to resume his smoking, mumbling to himself as he went, "He is a good sort, after all." An hour later, an aide-de-camp dispatched by the King found him there.

"His Majesty has sent me to tell you that he has granted you a pension of 300 francs from his privy purse," said the officer.

Jean Latapie (for that was his name) stood at the salute once more. "Very well," he remarked, with a somewhat sardonic smile. "Please to thank His Majesty for me, and to tell him that his kindness will enable me to buy two new ribbons instead of one ribbon per year for the cross given to me by the Emperor."

Thousands of those veterans were scattered through the French provinces, for Jean Latapie was not singular in his preference for a crust at home to two good meals daily at the Invalides. They propagated the Napoleonic faith and embellished the Napoleonic legend. I make a mistake, they did not embellish it—there was no need to do so: they had but to tell the unvarnished truth about that giant who in a few years transformed the whole of the political geography of the European continent; who made a King of Sweden out of a lawyer's son like himself; a King of Naples out of an innkeeper's son; a score of dukes and marshals out of as many stable-lads, millers' boys, coopers' apprentices, and Heaven alone knows out of what else. The rise of David and that of Joseph, as told in the Bible, are as nothing to that sudden leap into fortune of that lank-haired, sallow-faced Corsican lieutenant of artillery who, four years before the whole of the world rang with his name, was almost unknown to his brother-officers. And when some sergeant, like Boucard or Latapie, tells those marvellous tales and at their conclusion asks, in imitation of Sergeant Goguelat, of Balzac's *Médecin de Campagne*, "Do you think that all this was natural?" the simple listeners sitting in the inglenook can but reply, "No, it was not natural." And the hero of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the tales, *Le Petit Caporal,* becomes a god in the imagination of those humble folks to whom for nearly two decades he had proved a scourge by taking from them their husbands, fathers, brothers, and sons, of those humble folks who have suffered most from the two invasions, for let us bear in mind that the Napoleonic cult was ever much stronger in the rural than in the urban districts. The recollection of that fact will stand us in good stead by and by, when we shall have to watch the nephew of the giant "spiking" the ground for his rivals in the Presidential elections, the Ulm of his Austerlitz.

Nor must it be thought that the propagation of the Napoleonic cult was confined only to those who had founded the cult by the power of their swords—the surviving legionaries of the Grande Armée. Shortly after the sword had been sheathed the pen began its work, and before long, nay, even before the "martyr of St. Helena" had breathed his last, the glory of the victors of Waterloo had paled before that of the vanquished, for those who wielded the pen were poets, to whom a Cromwell, a Frederick the Great, or a Bonaparte is either God or Satan, sometimes both in one; who attempt, if they do not always accomplish, a *Paradise Lost* when they become inspired with the deeds of an immortal "clothed with mortal flesh." They were poets, not literary Cuviers and Owens, whose system admits not of heroes or criminals, but simply of vertebrate or invertebrate animals. Considerable as is the space so generously conceded to me, I cannot dwell at greater length on this apotheosis of Napoleon by Byron, Goethe, Heine, Hugo, Mickiewicz, and their satellites. One ought to have heard a Dumas—whose father suffered at the hands of Napoleon—and a Béranger speak of the modern Cæsar, as I have heard them speak at my uncles' home, to be able to judge of the effect, especially upon the younger generation of that period. Consequently as early as 1830, during the Revolution that cost the elder Bourbons their throne, there was already an attempt to restore the Empire. I can give chapter and verse for what I state. Talleyrand went to Vienna in secret, and, but for the opposition there, would have brought the Duc de Reichstadt (the King of Rome) to Paris. Louis Philippe owed Talleyrand nothing with regard to the crown which for eighteen years "rested" so uneasily on his head, and he was well aware of the absence of all obligation. Nay, it is extremely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doubtful whether Louis Philippe, who was one of the cleverest men on record, was not perfectly cognizant of his inability to struggle against the ever-growing influence of the Napoleonic legend, especially after the death of his eldest son and notwithstanding the fact that this legend was frequently sung to the tunes of the *Marseillaise* and *Le Chant du Départ* rather than to that of *Partant pour la Syrie.* He knew that Napoleon during the Hundred Days had allowed his soldiers to intone the revolutionary hymn attributed to Rouget de l'Isle, just as Napoleon's nephew made the military bands play it "by order" during the month of July, 1870. He knew, moreover, that the most formidable successor of Talleyrand—I am alluding to Thiers—would not scruple to use the lever of Imperialism to attain his own ends; he knew that he himself had contributed to the spread of the Napoleonic faith by the removal of the remains of Napoleon from St. Helena to Paris. Some one who knew it even better than he was Prince Louis Napoleon.

I repeat, Louis Napoleon knew most of this even better than Louis Philippe. Of all the members of the Bonaparte family, he alone had followed step by step the evolution of the Napoleonic legend, not only in its effects on France herself, but on England and Russia, whence, in the beginning, he foresaw the greatest opposition to his action when he should deem the time for action ripe. He alone had acted on two distinct occasions, while his relatives had looked on indifferently; some of them, notably Jérôme, the ex-King of Westphalia, and his son, who will be known to posterity as Plon-Plon, applauding most probably in their hearts of hearts at his failures. They could not have been far short of regretting that these failures had not led to a more fatal issue so far as Louis Napoleon himself was concerned, albeit that his success then would have given them that material prosperity and exalted position which they so undeservedly and greedily enjoyed during the Second Empire, for which they clamored incessantly, for which they began to clamor before Louis Napoleon was fairly seated in the Presidential chair.

"You have nothing of your uncle about you," said ex-King Jérôme one day, huffed at his nephew's refusal of his constant demands for money.

"Yes, I have," was the Prince-President's answer, "I have my uncle's family."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But Louis Napoleon was not the man to refuse money to any one, provided he had it or could borrow it; yet, notwithstanding his generosity to them as well as to others, the two Jérômes (father and son) would have almost rejoiced at the frustration of his hopes, for their dislike of him—let us say their jealousy—was even stronger than their greed. There could be no doubt with regard to Louis Napoleon's right to the succession of his uncle's throne after the death of the Duc de Reichstadt and Louis Napoleon's two elder brothers. Napoleon's first wishes on the subject, embodied in the Constitution of the Empire, left not the smallest loophole for misinterpretation; nevertheless in virtue of Napoleon's former dispositions, which were afterwards revoked—and with very good cause, apart from the claims of primogeniture—Jérôme never ceased to consider himself as wronged, as having been despoiled of the Imperial inheritance, and to a great extent imbued his son with the same ideas. As we proceed we shall see the effect produced by those ideas, in Plon-Plon's attitude toward his cousin during the latter's occupancy of the Imperial throne.

Of all the brothers of Napoleon, the younger was doubtless the least worthy; there is equally no doubt that in spite of Napoleon's knowledge of that worthlessness, his affection for him was stronger than that for any other member of his family, except, perhaps, for his sister Pauline. On that theory alone can one account for Napoleon's error in making Jérôme King of Westphalia. For he, who knew the working of men's hearts almost as well as Shakespeare, though he lacked the poetry wherewith to describe those workings, could not for one moment have flattered himself that the contact of this utterly feather-brained scapegrace, devoid of the slightest idea of moral responsibility, with the sober-minded, honest, though heavy Brunswickers, Hanoverians, and Hessians would be productive of the slightest good. And, as a matter of course, Jérôme impaired the prestige of his brother, and proved a thorn in his side during the whole of his (Napoleon's) reign, just as Jérôme's son impaired the prestige of his cousin and proved a thorn in his side during the whole of the Second Empire. With this difference, however, that the son was even more guilty than the father; for the latter had not an ounce of his offspring's brain, while on the other hand

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the son had not a grain of his sire's courage, which was that of the lion.

But even in the days of Napoleon, courage, though counting for much, did not count for everything, especially with the ruler of populations already exhausted by war. I hold no brief either for the memory of Napoleon I. or for that of Napoleon III. I am fully aware that the war contributions levied by the former were often very terrible; at the same time the very poor were not systematically ground down. Edgar Quinet, who assuredly is not suspected of a leaning towards Cæsarism, tells us that in the humbler dwellings in Spain, crude representations of the Emperor and of the principal events in his life hung side by side with the presentment of the Cid. In Russia the Napoleonic songs of Béranger were translated and became popular with the masses. The Count Lepic, travelling in Egypt, came at every step on "grateful recollections" of the "great Kebir," "who only levied taxes once," whom the people called "the just," the most magnificent title the Arab can bestow. After the fall of the Empire, the gondoliers of Venice refused to carry Marmont, and pointed the finger of scorn at him. "Do you see this man?" they cried to one another. "Well, he was the friend of the great Napoleon, and betrayed him." I fancy one might go from one end to the other of the former kingdom of Westphalia without finding the faintest trace of such good-will to the memory of Napoleon's brother, and I am not speaking of the present time, but of more than thirty years ago. On the day of the ex-King of Westphalia's funeral, I happened to sprain my ankle and was taken home by an old German gentleman who was a native of Cassel, and his grandson who was a Parisian by birth. The elder Körner's stories about the Court of King Jérôme caused my grand uncles to take a great fancy to him, and he and his grandson became frequent guests at our home. Those who have read *My Paris Notebook* are aware by this time of my relatives' mania for "taking notes," a mania which I have inherited. It is from their papers that I cull the following, only a few among nearly two hundred.

Among the various individuals who followed and accompanied Jérôme to Cassel—some clever, others hopelessly incapable, but all tainted with the same greed—there was a former captain of engineers with the name of Morio, who had been one of Jérôme's aide-de-camps during his successful campaign in Silesia (1807).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Morio was not devoid of courage or knowledge, but he was a "muddler," and a pretentious one at that, with a hankering for reforming things, and a "money grabber" besides. Jérôme made him his War Minister, and Morio, who saw his subordinates grow fat on the moneys extorted from the Westphalians under the then prevailing system of "substituting" for the military service, began to rack his brain for a reform that would fill his purse too. He issued an order that henceforth all officers should pay for their horses' fodder, intending of course to charge the War Chest—empty enough in all conscience—with the cost of said fodder and to pocket the proceeds. Most of the officers complied with the new regulations; a few proved absolutely refractory; among the latter General Allix, an able and meritorious officer whom Napoleon had sent to look after his brother's artillery. Shortly after this there was a grand field-day in presence of the young sovereign, who, to his intense astonishment, beheld General Allix trudging on foot behind his batteries.

"Why are you not on horseback, general?" shouts Jérôme.

"Because I cannot afford to pay for my cattle's fodder, and the State, it appears, cannot afford it either," shouts the other in reply, panting for breath and trying to keep up with his men.

This was long before Hervé had written his *Petit Faust*, in which Valentine recommends his *foot soldiers* "not to forget that they are on *horseback*." Jérôme, therefore, simply lent the general a mount there and then, and rescinded Morio's orders. General Allix's victory in this instance had apparently no effect on his outspokenness. A couple of days later Jérôme paid a visit of inspection to the Cassel arsenal. Catching sight of several obsolete pieces of ordnance in an angle, the King remarked, "General Allix, your guns are rather rusty." "*Parbleu*, Sire," was the immediate answer; "they are not intended for court carriages."

It was an indirect reminder to Jérôme that "show" in military matters, and especially in sober matters of war, was out of place; and Jérôme needed such a reminder, for notwithstanding his undoubted courage, and by no means inconsiderable tactical skill, he was too much addicted to the theatrical display with which the Bourbons previous to the Napoleonic era conducted their campaigns. The campaign in Silesia, which I mentioned just now incidentally, had been an instance of it, and he was not a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crowned sovereign then. In the one undertaken after his coronation, by order of his brother, who was already preparing the ground for Wagram, he might have been a veritable Louis XIV. or Louis XV., accompanied as he was by his ministers, the foreign ambassadors, his mistresses, a company of play-actors, scullions, etc. To the Blanche Carnegas and her fellow-concubines, as well as to their husbands, he distributed titles, distinctions, money, and estates with lavish hand; in that respect different from his son in after-years, for liberality, in no matter what way, waa not one of Plon-Plon's pet sins.

Both father and son had been residing in France for over a twelvemonth, by favor of Louis-Philippe, when the Revolution of 1848 broke out. When in after-years the would-be historians hinted that Louis Napoleon had played his cards well by selecting his uncle and cousin to watch events for him, he invariably smiled with that sphinx-like smile that might be construed into anything the interlocutor chose. And well might the Emperor smile at the idea of having derived help from these two. Bismarck said once that too much stress had been laid upon Napoleon III.'s intellectual capacities and not sufficient stress upon his generous and lovable disposition. The erstwhile Chancellor was not far wrong, but Napoleon III., though not an eagle, was not an imbecile, and to expect the two Jérômes to help him would have shown him to be a hopeless one.

After his escape from Ham and until the beginning of 1848, the greater part of which time Louis Napoleon spent in England, he had but one ally—or, to speak by the card, a faithful watcher of his fortunes—among the members of his family, whether legitimate or illegitimate; and that friend was a woman, his cousin Mathilde, the daughter of ex-King Jérôme. In some instances politically, in others socially, Prince Louis had forfeited the countenance of the rest. Morny never saw his half-brother until the latter had weathered the storm of the Presidential elections. There is no trustworthy evidence that they as much as corresponded before. Morny was an Orleanist, and, if the truth were known, had no exalted idea of Prince Louis's capacities. Colonna Walewski, the illegitimate son of Napoleon I., was to a certain extent affiliated to Thiers, and Thiers's views with regard to the game he meant the exiled Prince to play in the immediate future, if the opportunity should occur, were, I feel

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perfectly certain, never communicated to Walewski. I can but faintly touch here on the latter and Morny; they will appear again, and the reader may rest assured that I will not skimp their portraits then. Prince Louis's cousins on the father's side, the family of Lucien, were too occupied with their own affairs to bestow much thought on him; his cousins on the mother's side, the posterity of Eugène de Beauharnais, were allied by marriage to some of the reigning houses of Germany and to Czar Nicholas himself, whom the rumblings of the revolutionary storm which was to break all over the Continent of Europe filled with rage, while they filled the others with fear; and it must not be forgotten that Prince Louis had the reputation then of being an ardent republican, a reputation perfectly justified. Besides, all these, in common with Morny, were not far short of considering him a hare-brained dreamer and—his private life did not meet with their approval. That private life cannot be sketched here; we shall get glimpses of it as we proceed, when, though seated on the throne, he pays the penalties for some of its errors, and pays right nobly. Worse than all, from their point of view, Prince Louis was poor, and, if that be not a bull, not always careful to husband his poverty. He was prone to dissipation, addicted to gambling, and not always punctual in the payment of his debts. "*Je vous revaudrai ça un jour,*" said Gambetta, in acknowledgment of any favor in the days of his impecuniosity. I will not be certain that he kept his word when prosperity came. Louis Napoleon, who had a similar way of giving his friends liens on the future, never broke his, except in one instance, and that instance is sufficiently amusing to be recounted here, especially as it will afford the reader at least one glimpse of that private life to which I alluded just now.

It was in the summer of '60 or '61 that I went for the first time to Baden-Baden in company with my two grand-uncles, among whose acquaintances were all sorts and conditions of men. My relatives were talking to a M. Martin, a superannuated *croupier* of Frascati in Paris, who had been appointed inspector of the gaming-tables under the late François Blanc, of Monte Carlo fame. We were standing on the steps of the Kursaal—I, a lad of seventeen, but a precocious one, keeping my eyes and ears wide open for everything that was said and done. It is well known that the late Wilhelm I. of Prussia, before he succeeded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to his brother's throne, had several interviews with Napoleon III. at the fashionable resort, mainly through the instrumentality of Bismarck. On that day the Emperor was at Baden-Baden, and Prince Wilhelm and he were to meet in the Lichtenthall Allée. As a matter of course, the majority of the visitors were flocking thither.

"Aren't you going to the Lichthenthall Allée, Martin?" asked my uncle.

The old *croupier* shrugged his shoulders. "The sight of Prince Guillaume is no novelty to us. He comes pretty well every year."

"True; but what about Emperor Napoleon?"

"Emperor Napoleon," quoth Martin, pondering as it were; "I saw the first one when I was a lad. This one is the third son of Queen Hortense, the one who used to travel about a good deal. If I am not mistaken . . . ."

"You are not mistaken, Martin," came a voice from behind us. "He still owes twenty-five *louis* to the Bank."

I looked around and saw a thin, shrivelled, old man, below rather than above the middle height; it was the famous François Blanc.

If one of the Emperor's relatives had been near at the time, he or she would have smiled at the recollection of such a shady passage in the life of the man who at that very moment was virtually the arbiter of the destinies of Europe, and offered to pay the money there and then; and yet thirteen or fourteen years before that moment Blanc's sally would have roused his or her virtuous indignation. Princesse Mathilde Bonaparte, Comtesse Demidoff, was no time-server like that. To begin with, her own checkered existence had bred a large-minded tolerance for the foibles of men. No one had suffered more from such foibles than she, for her husband, Comte Anatole Demidoff, had the most marvellous and complete collection of them, and was little short of a madman besides. She knew, moreover, that her cousin Louis was not half as mad, nor a quarter, as her husband and the male members of his family, and that he had all the generous impulses of the Demidoffs. Thirdly, if Louis Napoleon had been the veriest raving maniac, she would have still clung to his fortunes, and furthered them to the utmost of her abilities and resources, for she acknowledged but one god, her uncle, the great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Napoleon, and she could then conceive of no other prophet than her cousin, the third son of Louis, ex-King of Holland and Hortense de Beauharnais. "Call a dog Bonaparte, and I will love him;" she might have said, paraphrasing Johnson. In that respect she was the daughter of her mother, that heroic Catherine of Wurtemberg, of whom Napoleon spoke with such admiration till the day of his death; she loved the name of Napoleon for the sake of the halo with which it was surrounded, not for the material gain it might bring. It was that fervent, disinterested love for Napoleon I. that won her the heart of Nicholas I., who, in spite of his real or fancied grievance against him, worshipped him as fervently as she did, and virtually freed her from the marriage bonds she had contracted with one of his nobles, as much for the sake of Napoleon's memory as from respect for her. That grievance was not due to Moscow or to Napoleon's European policy, but to Napoleon's somewhat offensive rejection of Nicholas's sister, Anna Paulowna, who became the wife of William II. of Holland. In principle Napoleon, who divorced Josephine because he wanted an heir, and, as a matter of course, a physically and mentally sound heir, was right at the moment of that rejection. Events subsequently proved that Napoleon may have been wrong, for William III. of Holland and his brothers and sisters were as physically and mentally sound as any one; *may* have been wrong, for I would not say the same for the descendants of William III.; I mean those who are dead. However, the goodwill of Nicholas, as we shall see presently, only extended to one member of the Bonaparte family; on personal as well as political grounds he objected *in toto* to "that lank-haired adventurer, the son of the devil knows who, and the devil's firebrand-envoy."

To Matilda Bonaparte all these contemptuous epithets, flung at her cousin's head, were as nothing, especially after Prince Louis' attempts at Strasburg, more especially after his attempt at Boulogne, and more especially still after his escape from Ham. Princess Mathilde is a septuagenarian, and, as far as I know, a hale and hearty one. The time to write her full biography is, let us trust, far distant. When that time comes, the historians will have to add her name to those of the Duchesse de Berry (the Comte de Chambord's mother), Princesse Adelaide (Louis Philippe's sister), and Queen Hortense of Holland, as one of the four women who have shaped to a certain extent the history of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

France during the nineteenth century. For the present I must confine myself to a preliminary statement. It was she who kept her cousin informed of the progress of the Napoleonic legend after Strasburg, after Boulogne; it was she who inspired him with courage by giving him the real reasons why those attempts had not been more rigorously visited on the participators of them, especially on the officers of the Forty-sixth of the line and the artillery troops of Colonel Vaudrey. It was she who repeated to him the answer, "*Il y aurait eu trop à punir,*" of the Duc d'Orléans (the father of the late Comte de Paris) to Colonel Taillandier, who had stemmed the tide of the insurrection at Strasburg, and who asked the Duc the question. It was she who bade her cousin humor or blindfold Lamartine when the latter in March, 1848, asked the former to return to London. It was she who supplied part of the sinews of war for the Presidential elections when her cousin did return; it was she who coached him in his game of political bluff with Victor Hugo, and Changarnier, and Thiers after he, Prince Louis, had been elected President; it was she who kept Dupin *Aîné* in good humor, so that he might signal to the future Emperor the cards held by his adversaries, only one of whom, Thiers, was formidable. The description of that game must be left to my next article.

ALBERT D. VANDAM.

(*To be continued.*)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROBLEMS BEFORE THE WESTERN FARMER.

BY THE HON. L. D. LEWELLING, GOVERNOR OF KANSAS.

THE outlook at the present time for the farmers of the West is anything but hopeful, though much may depend on legislation. The financial condition of Kansas is probably similar to that of other Western States, and according to the United States Census of 1890 the farm-mortgage debt of Kansas aggregates $167,145,000. But this only constitutes a part of the financial burden. The people are compelled to look to the natural resources of the State for the payment of most, if not all, existing obligations, and the total of these obligations is appalling. State, county, and municipal taxes are probably no higher than elsewhere, but the interest burden is the blight upon our prosperity. The following table is suggestive:

Real-estate mortgages on farms	$167,145,039
Real-estate mortgages on lots	68,340,069
Municipal debt, counties, school districts, etc.	37,817,755
Railroad indebtedness	459,892,907
State bonds	801,000
Chattel mortgage indebtedness of farmers, estimated	46,953,202
	$780,949,972

This shows a total indebtedness of nearly five hundred dollars for every man, woman, and child in the Commonwealth. It may be assumed that the railroad indebtedness should not thus be charged to the people, but leaving out this amount the remainder is sufficient to afford food for reflection. Forty-three per cent. of our agricultural class, embracing nearly eighty thousand families, are tenant farmers, and many of these are paying an enormous rate of interest upon chattel mortgages. It is said with much truth that the entire burden of debt hanging over the Western and Southern States must be paid by the agricultural

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class. And yet in Kansas more than ten thousand persons of this class are annually dispossessed of their homes in consequence of the foreclosure of mortgages, and the number is probably increasing rather than diminishing. Interest grows by day and by night, through the wet season and the dry, while land values decline and the price of products steadily depreciates; and "the end is not yet." The Commissioner of Labor says that the people of the State during the last ten years have practically lost nearly three millions of dollars because of declining prices of corn and wheat.

Twenty-five to twenty-eight years ago, with one bale of cotton a Southern farmer could buy nearly five hundred dollars, and with one sack of wheat (two bushels) a Northern farmer could buy five dollars. Now it requires seventeen bales of cotton and more than six sacks of wheat to bring these respective amounts. What is true of cotton and wheat is also true of other products of the farm. A few years ago an average horse would have been regarded as sufficient security for fifty to seventy-five dollars; but to-day it would require eight horses of the same kind to secure an equal amount. The farm which was regarded as ample security for fifteen hundred dollars is in many instances now sold for the mortgage, or perhaps less. And thus well-to-do farmers are being gradually forced into bankruptcy. Throughout the West, men who would borrow money find it impossible to offer security. The land remains, there are hogs and cattle and sheep, and the soil is as productive as ever; but none of these things has sufficient value. A man of my acquaintance recently went to market with a load of horses of average grade and received for the entire twenty-two head two hundred and twenty dollars; after paying freight and other expenses the horses netted him six dollars and fifty cents.

It is estimated to cost fifty cents a bushel to raise wheat, but it is worth in the home market forty cents. Five years ago the West had a great corn crop, Kansas producing 138,000,000 bushels; and while the price in Chicago and other central points was fair, it was mostly consumed in the payment of freight. With the declining price of farm products, interest on money remaining unchanged, and only a comparatively trifling reduction in the price of such things as the farmer must buy, he found it almost, if not quite, impossible to make a living on the farm.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was the unrest occasioned by these conditions in many Western and Southern States that caused the political revolt of the Farmers' Alliance a few years ago. Kansas was first to make a political protest. In all great grain and cotton producing States the farmers met in their schoolhouses to discuss the situation, and thus became more familiar with the history of the financial legislation of our own and other countries, and this investigation led to political organizations through which it was hoped to secure relief. As a drowning man catches at a straw, so persons in distress from other causes are ready to seize upon every proposition which promises relief. And it may be admitted that some of the remedies proposed by the farmers were visionary and impossible of application to existing conditions. But the body politic was very sick; and as every dose of medicine is said to be an experiment, so the people felt justified in prescribing some remedies which may have been doubtful.

To comprehend the condition of the Western farmers it must be understood that they are largely a debtor class, and they feel that in the gradual shrinkage of values they have been wronged. They also believe legislation to be responsible for this shrinkage, and look to legislation for the remedy. It was for this reason that the Alliance became a semi-political organization, and ardently supported the People's party, which declared for certain measures of relief demanded by the farmers. The Sub-Treasury plan was advocated by many members of the Alliance at one time, but in discussing details there was a wide divergence of opinion, and on account of this lack of agreement this plank, which appeared in the earlier platforms of the Populist party, subsequently disappeared.

The West is largely dependent upon the success and prosperity of its agricultural interests, and the political movement originating in the Farmers' Alliance, then developing into the Populist party, was and is in fact nothing more nor less than a defensive warfare for the preservation of the few privileges which remain to the agriculturist. With even moderate returns for their products the farmers would have been satisfied; but with the low prices, each year tending lower, interest and taxes became more burdensome, and attention was called to the enormous amount of money each year forwarded to the Eastern mortgage-holder. It was argued that the total increase of wealth in the United States since the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foundation of the government had not exceeded three per cent. per annum, and yet the Western farmers were compelled to pay tribute to money-lenders of six, eight, ten, and even twelve per cent. per annum, and were thus speedily driving forward toward bankruptcy. The conditions were emphasized in Kansas by pointing to the ten thousand farm people made homeless every year by mortgage foreclosures, who, being thus deprived of their homes, were made dependent on their labor for support, and thus swelled the great army of the unemployed. This, indeed, was the bond of sympathy everywhere between the farmer and laborer, and may account in some measure for the lively sympathy manifested by the farmers for striking laborers and the so-called Industrial Army. Each argued that he, himself, might soon become one of the homeless and unemployed. And this is one reason why partisan feeling became so intense among Populists. It was akin to the spirit of the Crusaders. The home and fireside, the happiness of children, the destiny of the unborn, seemed trembling in the balance, and all this was brought out in strong colors by many touching scenes. The newspapers made mention of a woman with three helpless little ones who made her home under a bridge on the highway. She was unable to find employment; too many in like circumstances, but without children, were offering their services. An old soldier dropped dead of starvation on the doorstep of the Court-house in Creston, Iowa, and it was afterwards ascertained that he had lived for days without cooked food, the last four days subsisting on wheat and water. These are only two of many instances which found their way into the newspapers and inspired the disciples of Populism to promulgate their doctrines with a sort of politico-religious enthusiasm seldom witnessed in political campaigns.

It is probable that the situation of the Western farmer might be improved by a better adaptation of crops to the soil and climate. There are some products, notably sorghum, Kaffir corn, alfalfa, and the like, which seem especially adapted to the more arid regions of the West; but the process of irrigation is now revealing new possibilities for these regions, and much progress has been made in the last two years in irrigating from wells in the bottom-lands. This method of farming would now receive wonderful impetus were it not that products thus raised, while generally better than those produced by old methods, still bring

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prices not at all commensurate with the labor and expensive methods of production. Indeed there is little hope for the Western farmer until business can be again stimulated and labor employed, so that the laborer may have money with which more freely to buy the products of the farm. It is none the less true, because paradoxical, that higher prices will be beneficial both to the producer and the laborer who must buy. It cannot be said that there is too much produced while men and women, honest and willing to work, are ill clad and unfed; while ten needy and shelterless women are struggling to secure every position offered for employment; and while bread-riots occur in the cities. While these things are true, it cannot be argued that there is too much bread or that the low prices result from over-production. If then there is no over-production, we must look elsewhere for the cause of low prices as well as the unrest and suffering among the people. To find the cause and remedy for these conditions is therefore the problem now before the Western farmer.

The Western farmer is a philosopher from necessity. Rapidly tending toward poverty, he demands to know why, and is intelligent enough to answer his own question in the light of reason. He believes the prime cause of all his woes is the manipulation of the money system of the country by unscrupulous and mercenary interests. He believes the decline of prices follows shrinkage of the volume of money in circulation, and that shrinkage in volume results from legislation. He does not believe that the government should increase the interest burden by borrowing gold, while our native hills are filled with silver, and labor stands idly awaiting an opportunity to take it from its hiding-place. He believes that government is, or should be, for the good of all the people, and that legislation should be for the multitude rather than for the few. He believes that government should afford protection to the weak; and he believes, finally, that if government, which assumes to guarantee life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, in reality guarantees nothing but wretchedness and want government has failed in its mission, and that he is living in an age of exquisitely refined barbarism rather than in the noonday light and love of Christian charity and progressive civilization.

L. D. LEWELLING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE YOUNG CZAR AND HIS ADVISERS.

BY THE HON. CHARLES EMORY SMITH, LATE UNITED STATES MINISTER TO RUSSIA.

THE character of autocratic rule obviously depends on the character of the autocrat. True, in these modern days, even the autocrat is largely the creature of conditions. Advancing civilization circumscribes and moulds imperial will by historic tendencies and overmastering public opinion. But, on the other hand, the currents of national development fall into the eddies of personal impulse. There are settled traditions and tendencies in Russia, but they are affected and modified by the dominant temper and influence of the hour. When Russia advanced from the sceptre of Nicholas I. to that of Alexander II. she advanced from the virile and robust imperialism of a splendid despot to the progressive and expanding liberalism of an enlightened ruler. When she passes from the reign of Alexander III. to that of Nicholas II. she passes from the tranquil, secure, rigorous sway of a firm, self-poised, austere, peace-loving monarch—to what?

The late Czar of Russia slowly but deeply impressed himself on Europe by three characteristics. First, he was recognized as an upright, conscientious sovereign, of moral rectitude, high personal character, and worthy public aspirations. Second, as a Russian of Russians, he aimed to cultivate the distinct national spirit of his own great Empire. Third, he was supremely devoted to the maintenance of peace in Europe. He was not Titanic like Peter the Great, or brilliant like Alexander I., or imperious like Nicholas, or fertile and flexible like Alexander II. But he was virtuous, exemplary, and faithful; he was loyal to duty as he understood it; he was industrious, plodding, and constant. He had strong religious instincts, and he sometimes mistook intolerance for religious duty. He loved the truth,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and hated lies and liars. If he was deceived and misled, it was not consciously or willingly. Slow in reaching conclusions, he was fearless and resolute in maintaining them. He was his own unfaltering master, and his ministers were his able servants. If his policy was sometimes questionable, his personality inspired respect and confidence.

Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to his internal rule, there is universal agreement in acknowledging the sobriety, the sagacity, and the strength of his self-determined rôle in the great European drama. He was indisputably the arbiter of Europe and the sheet-anchor of continental peace. It has been said that he wanted peace only until he could prepare his armies. This is not true. Alexander III. was devoted to peace for the sake of peace. There were warlike influences and tendencies about him, but he controlled and mastered them. He was not endowed with genius, and yet, without ostentatious assumptions or meteoric *coups*, he surely and firmly wrought a change which lifted Russia from a secondary position to the first place in the arbitrament of Europe. The consummate statecraft of Bismarck swung the European equilibrium on the pivot of Berlin; but measurably during his later career and still more palpably after his fall, the calm, steady grasp of Alexander III. moved the political centre of gravity from Berlin to St. Petersburg. He saved France from isolation and gave her security without giving her license. He checked Germany and cooled her aggression without alienating her friendship. In his own impregnable citadel of the north, with all the reserve power of his mighty empire, he said to the nations: "Peace; be still."

What of the new autocrat? Nicholas II. is young, untried, and inexperienced. Only twenty-six years of age, he comes unexpectedly to the throne while his father was still in his prime, with the reasonable assurance of a long reign before him. As a youth he did not ripen rapidly, and there was apparently no reason why his active initiation into public affairs should be hastened. After he passed his twenty-second year his development of character and intellect made a more distinct impress upon those about him, and beyond the ordinary course of education his father began slowly to prepare him for the high rôle he was destined to play. Without any large measure of responsibility he was brought more into public life. His tour through India and Japan broad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ened his horizon and strengthened his self-reliance. It is an interesting and, perhaps, suggestive fact that, as a part of this tour, a journey through the United States was at least considered and inquiries were made on the subject; but, whether for lack of time or for other reasons, it was not undertaken.

At the time of the great Russian famine the young Czarevitch, as a part of the plan of bringing him to the front, was made President of the Russian Relief Committee appointed by the Emperor. It was in conjunction with this committee that the American contributions of more than $100,000 in cash and five shiploads of food were distributed. Its work in directing the organization and operation of voluntary charity and relief was entirely distinct from the official machinery of the Government, and yet blended with it at points. The presidency of the heir to the throne gave it the highest dignity, and his personal participation in a movement which allowed independence of action accustomed him to a sense of responsibility. His earnest and discriminating expressions respecting the American gifts and the spirit lying behind them indicated a just understanding and an intelligent interest. Without striking personality or dominating characteristics he created the impression of being amiable, well poised, amenable to counsel, and controlled by a sense of obligation. He has had the inestimable advantage of being brought up in a family home of the deepest mutual affection and devotion, and of the sweetest and most wholesome influences. Alexander III., partly by his own rather sombre and severe nature, and partly through the melancholy circumstances of his accession, sympathized with the reactionary tendency. His public rigor seemed to be a part of his personal ethics. Nicholas is not as stern a moralist as his father; and while, in spite of the example of Alexander II., lax personal views and liberal public principles are not necessarily associated—and it would be a sorry thing if they were—yet, on the other hand, there may be a distinct public gain in a personal code which does not harden into general austerity.

The new Czar is believed to be of more liberal inclination than his predecessor. The events preceding and surrounding his accession have brought him into contact with Western ideas and influences. When Alexander III. came to the throne he was ten years older than his son now is. He had been married fifteen years. He had lived amid the agitation and turmoil which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

distinguished the stormy reign of Alexander II. His opinions and bent had been formed. He found himself Emperor through a bloody assassination which sent a thrill of horror through the world. These things confirmed the predisposition of his own mystic nature towards a reactionary policy. The circumstances under which the present Czar succeeds to the crown are different. He is younger and more plastic. The associations of his auspicious marriage are calculated to broaden and liberalize his mind, and it will be strange if they do not make him more open to the spirit of national progress. All indications within the few weeks of his reign point in that direction. The reports that orders have already been given contemplating a general system of elementary education, the enlargement of the powers of local self-government vested in the Zemstvos or provincial assemblies, and the development of the local representative system into a national parliament, must be received with reserve. These are too great changes—especially the latter, which involves the vital question of absolutism—to be undertaken without full premeditation, and it would be extraordinary if a young monarch suddenly thrust into the dazzling rulership of more than a hundred millions of people should immediately venture upon such radical reforms. But the steps which are sure and known, the acts of grace attending his accession, the modification of proscriptive measures, the recall of oppressive governors—all are hopeful indications. While his real character and policy are yet to be tested, there is much to encourage the belief that he will aim at internal pacification and progress.

But there will be no swift and signal change. In any estimate of the effect of a new personality on the throne, great account must be taken of the permanence of the Russian system. The Russian ministers are not personal favorites; they are able statesmen marked for their places by capacity and fitness. Their commission comes not from title of nobility, but from the higher title of brains. Curiously as it may cross the current idea of Russian autocracy, many of them sprang from the people. M. de Giers, the venerable, astute, and wise Minister of Foreign Affairs, —the prolongation of whose valuable and beneficent life would be an assurance of continued peace—did not inherit rank or fortune. M. Witte, the masterful Minister of Finance, was a few years ago a subordinate railway official in south Russia. He first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commanded special notice by taking the responsibility of disobeying the mistaken order of a superior. His decision and capacity attracted attention, and he was rapidly promoted until he was finally put at the head of the Finance Ministry as the fittest man in the empire for the place. Equally without rank was his predecessor, M. Vyshnegradsky—a conspicuously able man, upon whose table there was lying in 1890 the free silver bill precisely in the form in which it was lying on the desks of the American Senate, who knew its provisions to the minutest details, and whose comments, if they could properly have been reported, would have edified and almost startled the American people. M. Durnovo, the head of the other great Ministry of the Interior, belongs to the same class.

It is thus seen that with autocracy there is much of bureaucracy, and much of ability and stability. The change of Emperors does not necessarily mean a change of imperial agents. The changes are likely to come only as nature or chance compels them, and then they are likely to be governed by the same rule. The nobles do not constitute an official class. They make up the court, but do not make up the government. Under the Russian idea the Czar is the tribune of the people. Originally he was elected, and he is still regarded, however remotely, as their representative. Theoretically the government, though resting on one will, stands for the masses and not for the classes. If a personal allusion may be pardoned, a somewhat remarkable conversation of a high court official with the writer is recalled as illustrative of Russian sentiment. He said that Russian admiration and sympathy—not of the common people, but of the upper educated ranks—were extended overwhelmingly to Mr. Gladstone rather than to the Tory leaders of England. His explanation, if surprising, was at least simple. The Tories stood for the class idea, a kind of officialism based largely on title. Mr. Gladstone stood for the idea of the masses. Strange as it seemed, this was akin to the Russian idea. Russia had no primogeniture, no political nobility, no hereditary claims, no official class. Possibly the Russian admiration for Mr. Gladstone was increased by the feeling that he was not as strenuous in his foreign policy as some others; but the view here reported lets an interesting side-light upon the Russian theory.

The character of the Russian Government and the perma-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nence of the bureaucracy are far from precluding modifications. There are contests and cabals around the Senate House which overlooks the striking statue of Peter the Great, and in the great Ministries which face Alexander Place. Sometimes they are carried to the Anitchkoff or the Winter Palace. There are two distinct influences, one liberal and progressive and the other reactionary. M. Pobyedonostseff, the Procurator of the Holy Synod, has been the natural religious leader of the reactionary tendency. He belongs to the fifteenth century rather than to the nineteenth, and has been the embodiment and champion of the proscriptive spirit. He was the tutor of Alexander III., and this early association, together with his strong religious feeling, not unnaturally threw the late Czar considerably under his sway. But there is good reason to think that for some time his influence has been waning. Two years ago the *Grazhdanin,* the one journal of St. Petersburg which the Emperor himself was said to read every day, though itself reactionary, published a series of articles attacking M. Pobyedonostseff, and they were believed to be inspired by several of the Ministers. With the change of sovereigns, it is not probable that he can maintain his past prestige, and the policy of reaction and proscription will be weakened in the decay of one of its strongest pillars. Count Vorontzoff-Dashkoff, the Minister of the Imperial Household, and a man of great personal position and influence, though ostensibly keeping clear of politics, is a quiet and effective factor in the movement for progress, and it is already announced that he remains in that place of close and confidential relations.

In dwelling upon the stability of the Russian political system, which puts limitations even upon the autocrat, and which must be estimated in considering the probable course of domestic or foreign policy, it is not forgotten that in emergencies there have been marked and significant departures. Under Alexander II., Loris-Melikoff, Milyutin, and Abaza were the three conspicuous Ministers who represented the liberal policy. When Alexander III. speedily dismissed them and installed the absolutist Ignatieff, it signified the overthrow of liberalism. But that was an exceptional situation. It was a crisis of conflict and reaction. The Ministers were wholly one way and the Czar wholly the other. There is no such condition now. It is not a time of struggle and vehement fermentation. Outside of Pobie-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

donostzeff, none of the ministers holds any such pronounced position as would be incompatible with a reasonable modification of past tendencies. What is probable is that in the internal affairs of the empire the rigorous administration of oppressive codes will be mitigated. Whether this relaxation of harsh methods shall develop into a policy of real progress, depends upon the attitude of the Czar when his views become matured, and that is still a matter of conjecture. In foreign affairs he is reasonably sure to follow his father's devotion to peace. He has never given any sign of military ambition or of the aggrandizing spirit. He may have a warmer personal regard for the Emperor William, and family ties may exercise their influence in family affairs. But if necessary to maintain the European equilibrium and preserve peace, France will not be left without support. The wise statecraft of settled diplomacy is not to be lightly set aside on any personal caprice.

Nor, in an estimate of the forces which affect the present and future of Russia, must we fail to take account of the national sentiment. At the time of the Cronstadt ovations a former ambassador of Great Britain declared that these extraordinary demonstrations revealed to him for the first time the existence of a public opinion in Russia, and a public opinion so powerful that even the Emperor was constrained to bow before it. But it is questionable whether this was not a misuse of terms. There is no public opinion in Russia as we understand it—an opinion growing out of free discussion and based on independent inquiry and judgment. But there is a puissant national feeling which asserts itself sometimes with irresistible force. It was such a potent and irrepressible manifestation that compelled Alexander II. to enter upon the Russo-Turkish war. It was a similar expression in connection with the Cronstadt festivities that disclosed the overwhelming Russian demand for an attitude that would serve as a counterpoise to the Triple Alliance. Russia has faith in her destiny. One element would see her rise by being open to European influences and civilization and by playing a great hand in European politics. Another element would keep her a Slavic power, and limit and consolidate her national instincts and tendencies.

Alexander II. was a cosmopolitan. Alexander III. was preeminently a Russian. In the curious alternations which have followed each other in Russian history from the beginning of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

century, Nicholas ought to incline to liberalism. The late Czar sought to develop and cultivate the national spirit. Katkoff, the great Moscow editor, voiced the Russian aspirations for a distinct Russian policy and movement. Under that influence appealing to his own impulses, Alexander III. emancipated Russian statesmanship from German domination in foreign affairs and set about unifying his domain in its internal structure. In some directions this movement for nationalization had harsh expression, and in others it was more lax than might have been expected. After the Schleswig-Holstein war, Germany required the adoption of the German language in the churches of the conquered territory. But Russia still permits the local language in the Lutheran churches of the Baltic provinces. On the other hand, the brave and hearty Finns found it difficult to surrender any part of their ancient and cherished rights, and the Jewish proscription has been drastic and deplorable. The question of chief interest is not whether the new Czar will keep the peace, for on that point there can be no doubt, but whether he will ameliorate past conditions and face towards measures of progress.

Summing up, the change from an Emperor whose character and convictions and policy were fixed and known, to one whose mind is yet unknown, is something of an experiment. But the glimpses we have are encouraging, and the surroundings and conditions constitute a reasonable guarantee. The policy of peace will be preserved. National interests and national sentiment will control. Individual predilections and associations may determine personal relations, and may modify forms and expressions; but national forces dominate even Emperors. On the broad field of Europe the teachings of Alexander III. will be likely to guide his son. In the internal government of the Empire it is not probable that there will be any early or marked revolution. In time the pendulum may swing back to the more liberal side from which it oscillated after the cruel assassination of Alexander II. The first duty of a prudent sovereign is to know his realm, and while Nicholas II. is mastering his great trust, the personnel, and administration, and policy of Russia will hardly suffer any radical change.

CHARLES EMORY SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONCERNING NAGGING WOMEN.

BY CYRUS EDSON, M. D.

When Douglas Jerrold wrote that most interesting series, *Mrs. Caudle's Curtain Lectures*, he made all men and women who read them laugh most heartily. He drew fairly enough the portrait of the nagging woman; the woman who ceaselessly complains and scolds, and generally makes a nuisance of herself to every one who is cursed by being brought into contact with her.

In a ruder society than this, that existed at a time when men believed in physical punishment to a greater extent than they do now, the ducking or drenching stool and the branks were in vogue as special punishments for women who nagged and scolded. The first consisted of a rough seat at the end of a pole like a sweep. The offender, being well strapped in, was ducked in a pond a number of times. The second was an iron frame fitted on the head, with a projecting piece of iron which, when the frame was locked on, rested on the tongue.

There is a scientific aspect of this habit of nagging and scolding which is of no little interest. First, the effect of it on the person who nags; second, that on those who are nagged. Regarding the former, it must be premised that perfect health has, as one of its factors, content of mind. A nervous man or woman who is anxious, discontented, gloomy, dissatisfied, worried from any cause, cannot enjoy good health. This mental turmoil produces as one of its primary effects on the body an inability to digest food properly. The blood which should supply the force necessary for the function of digestion is continually drawn away from the stomach by the excitement in the brain, and the woman who nags suffers.

While there be those whose tendency to lay on fat is so great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that nothing will stop it, a nagging man or woman is generally thin. Their habit of mind has partially starved their bodies. It is a physical law that when nature attacks the health of an individual she calls to her aid innumerable factors or agencies, all of which tend to assist her in her destructive work, and this inability to properly digest, originally brought on by nagging, has its reflex action on the brain, and greatly increases the ability and the desire to nag. I have seen two cases of what Shakespeare calls "these cursed shrews" who died really as the result of the violence of their own tempers. It is more common, however, to find that this habit of dissatisfaction with all the acts of others produces in time some form of insanity. The excessive excitement wears the brain out at last. The Chinese punishment of lack of sleep produces mania about the thirteenth day, and although the influences to which naggers subject their own brains are not as acute, they in time are apt to bring about the same result. These people never give their brains the rest of contentment. They are never satisfied with anything done by others. As over two-thirds of their grievances are imaginary—that is, over two-thirds of the grievances for which they scold have no existence except as inventions in their own disordered brains—the inability of insanity to distinguish between the real and the unreal has begun to show itself. In view of the misery and unhappiness which naggers inflict on those around them, we need not waste much pity on them. The sooner they kill themselves, the sooner their insanity so far develops as to make it possible to place them in an asylum, the better it is for every one; for naggers are a curse, not only to themselves (they are most unhappy people), but every one. More than this, they do a fearful amount of harm. Take, for example, a busy man whose unkind fate has given him a nagger for a wife. In this day and generation to say a man is busy implies that he has need of every particle of force his food will supply to carry on his work. When this man comes home from his office he must have rest. This is not a thing he may dispense with; he *must* have it. When he takes his food he must be let alone, so that the blood will find its way to the stomach and there enable him to properly digest that food, so that he may acquire a fresh store of force for use on the morrow. If he does not get this force, then to do his work he must, by aid of stimulants, attract the necessary force from the reserves.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These reserves we call stamina. Now this means nervous exhaustion sooner or later, or else "this way madness lies."

The man comes home and the nagging wife begins. If the man be physically strong, fair-minded, and just, his mind will revolt in time from the injustice of his wife's accusations. It is the peculiarity of the nagger to enormously exaggerate everything, even if she do not invent her grievances. Forgetfulness on the part of a husband is annoying, as it is in any one, but it is not a crime. A continual stream of scolding, lasting three or four hours, over the failure to post a letter will cause any man to consider the effect disproportionate to the cause. If the husband be healthy, if he is not cursed with a highly nervous organization, what happens? The first thing is, that any love he may have ever had for his wife dies, drowned in the flood of words. Having murdered his love for her, the wife keeps up the nagging; he speedily begins to look on her as being a nuisance; from this to dislike and then to positive hatred is not a long journey. If there be children, the husband may continue to live with her for their sake, but it is an awful home in which to bring up children. The man quickly learns that he has in his physical strength something in which he can claim sanctuary. He may not actually beat her, because the restraining influences of his training have not lost their hold on him. Perhaps it would be better for her if he did, for physical fear of a whipping might be sufficient to make her control herself. While he may not lift his finger to her, he will invariably become brutal, except in such cases as I shall hereafter mention. In such a contest the woman has no chance. He may not be, he probably is not, able to give the rapier-like thrust of sarcasm which comes so easily to her, but he can use the bludgeon of abuse and profanity with terrible effect. The nervous condition the woman has created in herself by her nagging, itself renders her powerless before this weapon of her husband. Such a family is a hell on earth. It was the son of such a household who said in the simplest and most matter-of-fact way when he heard of a wedding, "Another life quarrel commenced!" What a comment on his parents!

Men of what I may call the second class take refuge from a nagging woman in flight. According to their degree in the social scale they resort to clubs or bar-rooms for that peace they can never find at home. Than we hear suddenly that So-and-So

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has gone to the dogs; his money has been lost in gambling, or he has become a drunkard. There are more of these men than most people imagine, and, for one, I have never been able to join in the chorus of sympathy for the wife.

It is on the third class of men that a nagging wife has the most baneful effect. It is saying little to say these men are ruined by the women they marry; ruined in body, in mind, in heart, and often ruined in purse as well, for they cannot do their work in life, owing to the nagging of their wives. These men are nervous, highly strung, to use a common phrase, and generally exceedingly affectionate. They have what I may call the "dog-like" disposition in the way they care for their wives, who are destroying them. They remind one of the old English rhyme: "A woman, a *dog*, and a walnut tree; the more you beat 'em the better they be." Nothing is more strange in human nature than the continued love these men give their wives. I knew of a case once where the nagging of a wife drove her nervous husband to an asylum, where he died, the victim of melancholia brought on by the ceaseless nervous irritation produced by his wife's tongue, yet to the day of his death he worshipped that wife. His greatest sorrow while in the asylum was the fact that he was not permitted to see her, her visits having been forbidden, because even when she had driven him crazy, she never saw him without nagging until he would have a most distressing attack of his malady afterward. Naturally the physicians in charge put a stop to her visits. Yet that woman, the murderess of her husband's mind, used to ask for and receive sympathy from her acquaintances on the ground that her unfortunate husband was insane. I never saw her without a feeling of abhorrence I cannot put into words.

All of us understand what a disagreement in judgment means, and we all know what it is to argue. We know that when we meet people who disagree with us on any matter—say the tariff, for example—there is a certain mental excitement produced by the argument that follows, which, providing the subject be on the tariff, is generally pleasant enough. During the heat of that argument it would be found, were one to take the temperature of certain parts of the head, that those parts were considerably warmer than the other parts of the body. After the argument is over there is, if it has been a sharp one, a feel-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing of slight fatigue; if the argument be held immediately after dinner the chances are it will be followed by a slight attack of indigestion. It produces other physical effects. Ofttimes a man will find his hands perspire in the palms, and if it be a cold day he will find the room, perfectly comfortable before, seems to have become warm. This means that the excitement in the brain produced by the mental effort in the argument has had a reflex action on the nerves of the body, and these in turn have induced a quicker beat of the heart. The phenomena I have described are familiar to all men. The essence of argument is opposition or disagreement. When one person scolds another the mental action of the second is opposition and disagreement. This needs no proof. A sharp scolding will bring on in the person scolded all the phenomena seen after a heated argument, and the reasons are apparent. Now, the essence of nagging may be said to be fault-finding or scolding. It is, in fact, nothing more than never-ending scolding; hence, nagging produces continual brain excitement and continual reflex irritation of the nerves.

It may be laid down as a broad proposition which will not be denied, that continued brain excitement has in time a disastrous effect on the cerebral tissue and the nerves. The physical injury done when the brain is continually excited by nagging is akin to that produced by overwork. While this is true, the injury is greater, because the excitement contains in it the element of anger. It is not only the stimulated mental condition of intense study or work; it is necessarily wholly without the element of tranquillity. It is a double irritation, a double excitement, in which each part acts and reacts on the other, intensifying the effect of both. I can illustrate my meaning by saying that, if the draft on the nervous force caused by anger be represented by x, and that caused by intense study by y, the draft caused by nagging would be xy, or, the first multiplied by the second. This means that nagging involves a most destructive waste of nervous force. It will be apparent from what I have said that not only is the person who is nagged subjected to an intense and destructive nervous strain, but that, owing to the fact that this implies a robbery of the other parts of the body of that excess of blood necessary to a proper accomplishment of their functions, the body is not allowed to create the force from the food taken which would in a measure support this strain.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is burning the candle at both ends with a vengeance. Small wonder then that men break down.

It sometimes happens that a woman is a nagger, owing to causes which she cannot control. There are diseases which affect women that have a most disastrous effect on the nerves, and therefore on the temper. There is no real difference between the nagging of these women and that of those who are simply naturally "cussed," because each is marked by the same unfairness, the same exaggeration of the alleged causes of grievance, the same eternal and ceaseless flow of words, the same envenomed personality in the attack, the same meanness in the imputation of the motives, the same insolence, the same inability to see what is true; but there is a most interesting and curious psychological difference in the effect of this nagging on the nerves of the person nagged. If a physician who has for a patient one of those docile "dog-like" men, who is rapidly being driven into a dangerous condition by the ceaseless nerve irritation, be able to tell the patient that the woman is not responsible for what she does, that she herself is the victim of disease, he will find an enormous change in the condition of that patient at once. Not only has the physician aroused a feeling of sympathy for the illness of the wife in the mind of the husband, but the nagging ceases to excite anger. The husband believes, first, that the wife is not responsible for her acts; second, that were she in possession of health she would not nag; third, that if her health could be restored the torture would cease. In other words, that which I have called x in my mathematical presentation of the mental condition is eliminated, and y only remains. What is more, the feeling of sympathy is in itself a force which will serve to neutralize the power of y. The nagging then becomes to the nagged the equivalent of a little more mental work, and this must be endured. To further illustrate the psychololgical side of this subject, all physicians are familiar with the nervous, irritable condition into which many women get prior to the birth of children. It often happens that this condition is in varying degree coincident with pregnancy, and that, as a result of it, the wife nags unceasingly. This has no effect on the husband whatever, provided he understands the cause; on the contrary, he will not only be able to control his temper, but he will often find the most outrageous accusations, which, were they made by another or by his wife without a cause

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beyond her control, would produce in him extreme indignation and anger, have no effect on him. Under such circumstances he will not only never allude to them, but will, should the wife, as she often does, recall them with shame, belittle them to the utmost or stoutly deny that she ever said such things. These two statements of the psychological effect on the mind of the husband, of the conviction of the irresponsibility of the wife for the nagging, not only point to the method by which the physician may help a patient suffering from nagging, but they show up sharply the real source of the nervous irritation from which such patients suffer. This is the conviction in their minds that other people can believe such things as are said to be true of them. In other words, it is in the revolt against the injustice of nagging and the anger resulting from the necessity of such revolt that the chief part of the nervous irritation of nagging is to be found.

There exist in Spain and Italy certain persons who pursue one of the most damnable trades known to men. These are they who distort the limbs of children in order to produce those deformities which will excite the compassion of the charitable. These manufactured cripples supplied Victor Hugo with the subject of one of his most fantastically horrible tales, *L'Homme Qui Rit*. It is needless to say that these people, whenever found, are punished as severely as possible by the law. The imagination almost shrinks before the devilishness of man which can permit itself to take a child and distort and twist and misshape its soft bones until it is a perfectly helpless cripple, destined to draw out his or her weary life in pain. When we contemplate such acts there is a feeling of ferocity produced, and one feels that the worst tortures of the Middle Ages, or of such abodes of cruelty as Siam or China are too mild, for children are so helpless, so unprotected; cruelty to them is such devilish, cowardly, mean cruelty!

What, then, shall be said of that nagger who distorts and twists and misshapes the mind of a child? What shall be said of the woman who cripples all the moral innocence and mental powers of the little ones committed to her care? Is not this damnable, devilish? Does not such a woman deserve the execration of all men and women? The effect of nagging on men of "dog-like" dispositions has already been described. Unfortunately—I should say fortunately, for what is more beautiful and what should be more sacred than the unquestioning confidence and trust of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

little ones—all children are "dog-like." It is true, a majority are nothing more than healthy little animals from whose minds and memories scolding runs off as water from the back of a duck, but there are children (and in this age of nerves I should think the proportion would be about one in twenty) who are exceedingly sensitive. Unfortunately, too, the child of a nagging woman and a "dog-like" man has every chance of having a most nervous disposition. It seems to me the spectacle of one of these nervous children, timid, affectionate, with a strongly developed conscience, in the grasp of a nagging mother, is the most pitiable I know of, the little one is so helpless, the torture is so fiendish. Often a child is simply nagged to death, and one is bound to feel only joy over the deliverance; for, if it lives, it reaches manhood or womanhood with shattered nerves and a ruined constitution. The physical result in the case of such a child may be better understood by a brief reference to what childhood means. Childhood is the period of growth; the child is given by nature an extraordinarily active digestion; children eat nearly three times as much food in proportion to their weight as do grown people. The food provided by nature for the infant is wonderfully nutritious; no such amount of all the elements needed for growth and development is to be found in any combination of which we have knowledge. During the first ten years of a child's life its business is to grow. The more of an animal we can keep it during this period the better. It ought to eat, to sleep, to play, romp, enjoy itself in a physical way at this time in its life. It must in part prepare itself for life's work. It lays the foundation of that physical structure which in time will be crowned by mental achievement. I am glad to say people are beginning to understand that children should not be forced too much mentally during the first ten years of life.

If a nagger be allowed to interfere with a child at this time the result is disastrous. Children have a far keener sense of justice than the majority of people believe, but so far as the expression of this feeling is concerned they are dumb. Under the torture of nagging, more than often emphasized by slapping or whipping, they must suffer in silence. "It's no matter, dolly, if you didn't, you have got to be slapped," said a little girl once to her doll, and I think no such indictment was ever drawn by men skilled in the law as was this against that little one's mother. In place of being allowed to grow strong, to digest their food properly and build up

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for themselves healthy bodies, the children of nagging women have the force diverted into the support of their nerves under the attacks made on them. Is it any wonder if they have no constitutions when they reach manhood or womanhood ?

Not only is the child's physical health ruined, its mind is injured more than I can easily explain. The constant exaggeration inseparable from nagging prevents the growth in the mind of the child of mental perspective. Children are essentially imitative; they receive most of their impressions second-hand. This is necessarily so at first in any one's life, because, of all mental processes, judgment is the slowest of development. When, therefore, a child is in constant contact with a person who takes enormously exaggerated views of everything, it never has a chance to understand judgment. Its mind grows one-sided ; it learns to look on everything from the standpoint of its conceptions. It would be impossible to imagine a worse preparation for the business of life. Nor is this all. The effect of nagging on the child's moral qualities is extremely bad. The constant, unceasing injustice warps the better nature. The dumb anger induced through so many years stimulates the growth of passion in the mind of the child; in time it becomes absolutely unable to do justice to others, simply because its sense of justice, naturally strong in all children, is destroyed. Just as tyranny makes tyrants of those tyrannized over when they in turn have power, so the injustice of nagging kills the sense of justice. Then, too, in order to shield itself from the intolerable torture, the child naturally resorts to lies. It is not to be blamed for this, for, as the exaggeration of nagging is almost invariably nothing but falsehood, the little one cannot know any better.

What remedy is there ? I say regretfully, there is none whatever except public opinion. Those who suffer, if they be adults, shrink from facing their misery, and if they are children, they know of no appeal. There is, however, a duty which should be regarded as sacred. If there are children, and if the wife or husband be a nagger, then the other should do something to protect the little ones. He or she who refuses is as guilty toward them as is their torturer. I may say more guilty, because she or he knows from personal experience what the torture is. The little ones can have no other friend; no one else knows ; no one else can interfere.

CYRUS EDSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FUTURE OF GOLD.

BY THE HON. ROBERT E. PRESTON, DIRECTOR OF THE MINT.

THE history of the production of gold may be divided into four periods: the first ending with the discoveries of Columbus, the second with those of the Californian and Australian goldfields in 1848 and 1851, or say 1850; the third in 1885; the fourth begins in 1886, with the discovery of the Witwatersrandt gold mines.

The year in which these mines were discovered is chosen as the beginning of the last period, and not 1887, in which the Transvaal began to figure to some small extent in the list of gold-producing countries, for their discovery is of far greater importance to the world than the few thousand ounces of gold which they added to the supply of that metal in the latter year.

It cannot be disputed that the discovery of the Witwatersrandt mines marks an epoch in the history of the production of gold, and is entitled to a place side by side with the discovery of the mines of California and Australia, which has always been considered by statisticians a point of demarcation between two periods in the history of the production of the precious metals.

On the first two of the periods into which the history of the production of gold has been divided above it is not necessary to dwell here. The third might also be passed over in silence, were it not necessary to compare it with the fourth, in order to form an intelligent opinion on the relative magnitude of the output of gold in recent years, on its prospective production in years to come, and to bring out into strong relief the fact that never before in the life of mankind has the yearly supply of that metal been as great as now. To effect this purpose, it is necessary to go back a few decades before the beginning of the third period.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The average yearly production of gold during the ten years 1831–1840 was only 20,289 kilograms, or 652,291 fine ounces; during the ten years 1841–1850 it rose to an annual average of 54,759 kilograms, or 1,760,502 ounces. This was just prior, it will be noticed, to the beginning of the third period into which I have divided the history of the production of gold. Now mark the increase! During the five years 1851–1855, in consequence of the rich harvest from the recently discovered mines of California and Australia, the average annual production of gold suddenly leaped to 199,388 kilograms, or 6,410,324 ounces, and in 1856–60 to the highest figure that had ever been reached up to that time, and which has never been exceeded since, except in 1892, 1893, and 1894, namely, to 201,750 kilograms, or 6,486,262 ounces; that is, in between twenty and twenty-five years, the annual average of the production of gold increased nearly tenfold! Even the production of silver during the last quarter of a century has not increased at that rate—1,000 per cent.!

After 1860 the average steadily declined, except during the five years 1866–1870, until in 1881–1885 it fell to 149,137 kilograms, or 4,794,755 ounces.

Thus the decrease in the annual average production of gold after 1860 had been continuous for almost a quarter of a century, and there were not wanting prophets of evil, among them men of world-wide renown in science, like the eminent Austrian geologist, Dr. Suess, who prophesied that the decline would be permanent. Suess's book, *The Future of Gold*, published in 1877, created a sensation in the politico-economic world, although the point from which he viewed his subject was strictly that of a geologist and not of an economist. His celebrated theory is contained in the fourth and fourteenth chapters of his book. Briefly stated, it is this. The earth was myriads of ages ago in a molten or fluid state. When in that condition the heavier elements of which it is composed sank, in obedience to the law of gravitation, deepest, and now lie nearest to the earth's centre. But the precious metals are among the heaviest of all materials—gold, with a specific gravity of 19.253, ranking third, immediately after iridium and platinum. Much lower in specific gravity are silver (10.74), copper (8.09), iron (7.54), etc., but all with a much higher specific gravity than the earth as a whole. Gold is therefore one of the metals furthest removed from the earth's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

surface and most inaccessible to man, "because, at a comparatively small distance from it, the increasing temperature reaches so high a degree that mining there finds its limit."

After an exhaustive review of all the gold-fields of the world, and of their condition at the time he wrote, Suess reached the following conclusions :

1. That the production of gold in the future would have to depend mainly on the output from alluvial deposits.

2. That geographical discovery and the new or increased production of gold went hand in hand.

3. That much more than one-half of the quantity of gold obtainable by the means hitherto employed had already passed through the hands of man.

4. That the exhaustion of the alluvial gold deposits and the decline of the production of gold to a small fraction of what it had hitherto been, were facts that could already be foreseen.

5. That the time would certainly come, and probably after a few centuries, when the production of gold would cease to an extraordinary extent; and that metal, on account of its ever-increasing scarcity, cease to be able to maintain the economic position it had hitherto held.

6. That the manner of the occurrence of gold in nature was, therefore, unfavorable to the general adoption of the gold standard, and that such a plan, in the light of past experience of the production of gold, could not be approved.

7. That it had been proven that vein-mining, as a rule, showed a decrease in gold contents with the depth.

What of Suess's conclusions ? Scarcely one of them has been verified by the experience of the last seventeen years. Production now depends much more on vein-mining than on gold-washings. Fully 60 per cent. of the world's production of gold is obtained from the solid rock. There has been increased production independent of geographical discovery by improved technic processes, especially by the cyanide process. Gold production is not declining, but advancing; and in South Africa it has been demonstrated that the gold contents increase with the depth.

If Suess's book had been published in 1857, instead of 20 years later, the world would have ridiculed his theory, notwithstanding the learning, ability, and acumen of its author. But it appeared at a time when the production of gold had been, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

still was, on the decline, and when men's minds were prepared to believe that the decline would be permanent and irretrievable.

That it has not been so is amply demonstrated by the yield of gold during the fourth period of the history of its production, as will be seen from the figures given below, in which the output of the yellow metal in 1886–1893 is given in fine kilograms and fine ounces.

Years.	Kilograms.	Ounces.
1886	159,494	5,127,750
1887	159,155	5,116,865
1888	165,809	5,330,780
1889	185,809	5,973,780
1890	178,828	5,749,320
1891	196,584	6,320,195
1892	220,129	7,077,165
1893	234,006	7,523,377

The first rude shock which Suess's theory received was the discovery of the Witwatersrandt gold-field, in the South African Republic, which marks the beginning of the fourth and last period into which the production of gold has been divided by the writer. Here was something new which had not been dreamt of in Suess's philosophy.

The mines of the Witwatersrandt did not share at all in the world's gold output of 1886. In 1887 they shared in it only to the extent of 23,125 ounces. Since then their production has been phenomenal. It has been as follows:

Years.	Crude ounces.
1887	23,125
1888	208,121
1889	381,758
1890	494,869
1891	729,238
1892	1,210,868
1893	1,478,473

The increase in recent years in the world's production of gold is due most largely to these South African mines. Will that increase continue, and how long? The answer to this question involves a consideration of the prospects of production in South Africa. I remarked above that here was something Professor Suess had not dreamt of in his philosophy. The Witwatersrandt mines had not been discovered when he wrote his book. Not only that, but the occurrence of gold under the geological conditions in which it is found in the Witwatersrandt had been con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sidered impossible until it was actually obtained there. Geologists were acquainted in 1877 with only two forms of the existence of gold in nature: in veins and as alluvial deposits. In the Witwatersrandt it is found in sedimentary rocks—in strata the component parts of which are pieces of quartz held together by a clayey cement.*

The Witwatersrandt produces by far the greater part of the total gold output of South Africa—indeed of all Africa.

In 1893 the German government sent a mining expert, Herr Schmeisser, to investigate and report upon the gold mines of the Transvaal. In his report he expresses the opinion that a calculation of the total amount of gold in the Witwatersrandt is impossible, and that in making an estimate of it it is necessary for the present to limit one's investigation to a well-defined and adequately explored tract of the district, and endeavor to establish the lowest figures for that section. For that purpose he chose the part of the gold-field lying between the eastern limit of what is known as the Langlaagte B gold mine and the western limit of the Glencairn mine, which has a profitable working length, he stated, of about eleven and a half miles. It is not necessary, nor have I space, to give here the data he employed. It is sufficient to say that he calculated that from this tract 62,548,000 ounces of gold could be obtained. As, however, nearly two-thirds of the total yield of the Witwatersrandt, from 1888 to January 1st, 1894, had come from mines in that tract, the above figures had to be reduced to 59,572,149.6 ounces, of the value of $1,020,828,355, which still remained to be mined. At the average rate of increase of the gold product of the Witwatersrandt he estimated that the exhaustion of the lodes on this tract would occur about the year 1919. This calculation was made on the assumption that a depth of 800 metres, or 2,625 feet, had been reached. If mining could be carried on at a depth of 1,200 metres, or 3,937 feet, the supply of gold from this tract, he calculated, would aggregate 99,821,892 ounces, of the value of $1,710,560,000, and that at the same rate of increase it would require forty years to mine that quantity. Mr. Hamilton Smith, a distinguished American mining engineer, in 1892 estimated the amount of gold in this same tract to a depth of 3,000 feet at

*A somewhat similar formation of very limited extent had, it is said, been previously discovered in France.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$1,044,900,000. Herr Schmeisser ascribes the larger results reached by himself partly to a slight difference in the length of tract investigated and partly to the fact that a deep boring made in 1893 in one of its mines warranted him to assume a less rapid dip of the lodes at lower depths. It must be remembered that while the tract under consideration above has a length of only about 11½ miles the Witwatersrandt has a length of 50 miles.

It would be an easy matter to cite a host of experts whose evidence is corroborative of that just quoted. Indeed all competent judges agree that the gold output of the Witwatersrandt mines is assured for a considerable period of time. The pyrites occurring at a certain depth, which could not be treated by amalgamation, have yielded up their gold contents to chlorination; and it has become possible, by the introduction of the cyanide process, to obtain almost the last traces of gold from the "tailings," which had hitherto been considered worthless. At present only 5 per cent. of the gold is lost. In 1892, 211,866 ounces were obtained from tailings by the cyanide process, while, lately, the amount of gold obtained by this method has been, it is claimed, more than one-third of the Witwatersrandt's total output, amounting, as it did, in September, 1894, to 62,000 ounces out of a total of 175,000 ounces.

In the United States the production of gold had been very uniform since 1887, never varying much from 1,596,375 fine ounces, or $33,000,000, until 1893, when it amounted to 1,739,323 ounces, or nearly $36,000,000. It is noteworthy also that the gold output of this country in 1893 was the largest since 1880 and came within 1,677 ounces, or about $45,000, of equalling the yield of that year.

The net increase of the gold output of the United States in 1893 over that of 1892 was $2,940,000. The increase was most noteworthy in Colorado ($2,227,000) and Montana ($684,613). On the other hand, the product of Nevada decreased $613,000, out of a total decrease in six States of $928,785.

It is too early yet to state positively what the gold product of the United States was in 1894, but this much is certain: that it will largely exceed that of 1893 and probably reach $43,000,000, an increase of $7,000,000 over that of the latter year.

The tendency of all the gold-producing States is to add to their annual product. The repeal of the purchasing clause of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

act of July 14, 1890, has stimulated the search for gold, and a good share of the increased gold output of the country in 1894 will be traceable to it.

There are no indications whatever of a falling-off in the future of the productiveness of the gold mines of this country, although, considering the rapid growth of the South African production of gold, it is difficult to predict how long the United States will maintain its supremacy as a gold producer. New mines will, of course, be discovered here, but the discovery of such mines is still more likely in Africa. Much will depend on their relative richness. So far as can now be seen, the greatest hope of a largely increased gold product of the United States in the future lies in the removal of all restrictions on hydraulic mining in California. That has already been done to some extent by the so-called Caminetti Act, passed March 3, 1893. If means could be found to remove all restrictions on this class of mining—and that may be a possible achievement—it has been estimated that the deposits in that State would add something like $500,000,000 to the gold stock of the world.

In Australasia, the production of gold in 1893 was 53,698 kilograms, representing $35,688,620, against 51,398 kilograms, representing $34,158,966, in 1892, an increase in the former year of 2,300 kilograms. In like manner 1892 showed an increase of 4,152 kilograms over 1891. Indeed, ever since 1886 it may be said that the gold output of the Australasian colonies has been continuous. The falling off of the yield in 1890 and 1891 from that in 1889 can scarcely be said to have broken the continuity referred to, for both 1892 and 1893 show a marked increase over 1889.

The product from alluvial deposits is continually decreasing in Australia, and that from quartz mining increasing. The alluvial deposits yield only about one-third of the total product of Victoria and not five per cent. of that of Queensland. On the other hand, "the deep leads," which are only deep alluvial beds, but which must be worked like veins, are far from being exhausted. Thus far they have been operated only to a very limited extent. Moreover, a large number of quartz mines have heretofore been abandoned as soon as the pyrites was reached. There is no reason why work on such mines should not be resumed, with the aid of the newly discovered processes which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have proved so successful in South Africa, and with equally successful results. Everything considered, it is to be expected that the production of Australasia will continue to increase at about the present rate at least for an indefinite period. There is even a possibility that it may increase largely after some years, and the realization of that possibility depends on how the newly discovered Coolgardie gold-field in western Australia turns out. By comparing the gold product of all the colonies of Australasia in 1893 with that of 1892, it will be found that there was an increase in 1893 of 80,432 unrefined ounces. More than 63 per cent. of this increase came from the recently discovered western Australian goldfield of Coolgardie. This field may hold a large reserve of the yellow metal and play a very important part in the future of gold.

Russia next claims our attention. Here, too, where the gold yield is almost exclusively from alluvial deposits, the production of that metal has been continuously increasing since 1886, as witness the following figures: 1886, 30,872 kilograms; 1887, 30,232 kilograms; 1888, 32,052 kilograms; 1889, 35,970 kilograms; 1890, 35,296 kilograms; 1891, 36,356 kilograms; 1892, 37,325 kilograms; 1893, 39,804 kilograms. The continuity of the progression is broken only in a single year. It is impossible, however, to venture any prediction as to Russia's output of gold in the future. The circumstances on which it depends are too many—legislation, the price of bread, the seasons, and the course of the paper rouble. Reasoning from analogy, however, one would be inclined to believe that the production of gold in the great empire of eastern Europe would continue to increase for years to come.

Again, there is India. Outside of the great producing countries—the United States, Australasia, Russia, and South Africa—the increase in the production of gold has nowhere been more rapid: 1886, 20,383 fine ounces; 1887, 15,464; 1888, 32,729; 1889, 72,691; 1890, 96,739; 1891, 120,691; 1892, 160,525; 1893, 184,477.

The remaining countries to which I shall direct the attention of the reader during the years of the last period of the history of the production of gold are the three Guianas. Their gold yield was as follows: 1887, 1,802 kilograms; 1888, 937; 1889, 2,348; 1890, 3,186; 1891, 5,026; 1892, 6,185; 1893, 6,439.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The little table which I here append will enable the reader to take in at a glance what the countries named in it have done towards preventing a scarcity of gold, and hindering its appreciation during the fourth period in the history of the production of that metal.

Countries.	1886.	1887.	1888.	1889.
United States	$35,000,000	$33,000,000	$33,175,000	$32,800,000
Australasia	26,425,000	27,327,600	28,560,660	33,086,700
Russia	20,518,000	20,092,000	21,302,000	23,905,6 0
Africa	1,438,000	1,919,600	4,500,000	8,586,600
India	421,600	320,000	676,563	1,502,600
The Guianas	.....	718,902	623,070	1,560,300
Total	$83,802,600	$83,378,102	$88,837,293	$101,441,800

Countries.	1890.	1891.	1892.	1893.
United States	$32,845,000	$33,175,000	$33,000,000	$35,955,000
Australasia	29,808,000	31,399,000	34,159,000	35,688,600
Russia	23,458,000	24,162,500	24,806,200	26,454,400
Africa	9,887,000	15,742,400	24,232,000	29,305,800
India	2,000,000	2,495,000	3,318,300	3,813,600
The Guianas	2,117,200	3,340,200	4,110,900	4,279,400
Total	$100,115,200	$110,314,100	$123,626,400	$135,496,800

The production of the world in 1886 was 159,494 kilograms; in 1893 it was 234,006 kilograms; but, great as was the world's gold output of that year—greater than that of any other year in the world's history—I believe that that of 1894, and of a series of years to come, will be successively and progressively greater, and that what was said by the writer of the world's gold product in 1893 in the Report on the Production of Gold and Silver in that year, will, with the change of a few figures, be true of that series. He there uses these words: "The world's output of gold in 1893 was the largest in history, amounting, as it did, to 234,006 kilograms, of the value in round numbers of $155,522,000.

"The highest previous yield of gold was in the period 1856–60, when the production reached an average weight per annum of 201,750 kilograms fine, and an average yearly value of $133,970,000. The output of gold, therefore, in 1893 was 16.08 per cent. greater than the annual average of the period of the greatest productiveness of the Californian and Australian gold mines.

"A still more noticeable fact is that the value of the gold product of the world in 1893 was only 8.77 per cent. less than the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

average aggregate value of the gold and silver product of the world in 1861–1865."

The fact is that the production of gold was never so rapid as it is to-day. When the yield of the Californian and Australian gold mines was at its highest, 1856–60, Michel Chevalier and other economists began to inquire what measures governments should take to prevent the depreciation of the yellow metal, and some even proposed its demonetization. Yet now when the production of even 1856–60 is exceeded, and when the value of the annual product of gold alone is almost equal to that of the product of both precious metals before the depreciation of silver began, all the economic evils from which the commercial, agricultural, and industrial world is suffering are ascribed to the scarcity of gold! What better refutation can there be of such a fallacy than the figures adduced in the foregoing pages? They are more convincing than words; for if there is a scarcity of gold now, when was there plenty of it?

R. E. PRESTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT PAUL BOURGET THINKS OF US.

BY MARK TWAIN.

He reports the American joke correctly In Boston they ask, How much does he know? in New York, How much is he worth? in Philadelphia, Who were his parents? And when an alien observer turns his telescope upon us—advertisedly in our own special interest—a natural apprehension moves us to ask, What is the diameter of his reflector?

I take a great interest in M. Bourget's chapters, for I know by the newspapers that there are several Americans who are expecting to get a whole education out of them; several who foresaw, and also foretold, that our long night was over, and a light almost divine about to break upon the land.

"*His utterances concerning us are bound to be weighty and well timed.*"

"*He gives us an object-lesson which should be thoughtfully and profitably studied.*"

These well-considered and important verdicts were of a nature to restore public confidence, which had been disquieted by questionings as to whether so young a teacher would be qualified to take so large a class as 70,000,000, distributed over so extensive a schoolhouse as America, and pull it through without assistance.

I was even disquieted myself, although I am of a cold, calm temperament and not easily disturbed. I feared for my country. And I was not wholly tranquilized by the verdicts rendered as above. It seemed to me that there was still room for doubt. In fact, in looking the ground over I became more disturbed than I was before. Many worrying questions came up in my mind. Two were prominent. Where had the teacher gotten his equipment? What was his method?

He had gotten his equipment in France.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Then as to his method: I saw by his own intimations that he was an Observer, and had a System—that used by naturalists and other scientists. The naturalist collects many bugs and reptiles and butterflies and studies their ways a long time patiently. By this means he is presently able to group these creatures into families and subdivisions of families by nice shadings of differences observable in their characters. Then he labels all those shaded bugs and things with nicely descriptive group names, and is now happy, for his great work is completed, and as a result he intimately knows every bug and shade of a bug there, inside and out. It may be true, but a person who was not a naturalist would feel safer about it if he had the opinion of the bug. I think it is a pleasant System, but subject to error.

The Observer of Peoples has to be a Classifier, a Grouper, a Deducer, a Generalizer, a Psychologizer; and first and last, a Thinker. He has to be all these, and when he is at home, observing his own folk, he is often able to prove competency. But history has shown that when he is abroad observing unfamiliar peoples, the chances are heavily against him. He is then a naturalist observing a bug; with no more than a naturalist's chance of being able to tell the bug anything new about itself, and no more than a naturalist's chance of being able to teach it any new ways which it will prefer to its own.

To return to that first question. M. Bourget, as teacher, would simply be France teaching America. It seemed to me that the outlook was dark; almost Egyptian, in fact. What would the new teacher, representing France, teach us? Railroading? No. France knows nothing valuable about railroading. Steamshipping? No. France has no superiorities over us in that matter. Steamboating? No. French steamboating is still of Fulton's date—1809. Postal service? No. France is a back number there. Telegraphy? No, we taught her that ourselves. Journalism? No. Magazining? No, that is our own specialty. Government? No; Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, Nobility, Democracy, Adultery—the system is too variegated for our climate. Religion? No, not variegated enough for our climate. Morals? No, we cannot rob the poor to enrich ourselves. Novel-writing? No. M. Bourget and the others know only one plan, and when that is expurgated there is nothing left of the book.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I wish I could think what he is going to teach us. Can it be Deportment? But he experimented in that at Newport and failed to give satisfaction, except to a few. Those few are pleased. They are enjoying their joy as well as they can. They confess their happiness to the interviewer. They feel pretty striped, but they remember with reverent recognition that they had sugar between the cuts. True, sugar with sand in it, but sugar. And true, they had some trouble to tell which was sugar and which was sand, because the sugar itself looked just like the sand, and also had a gravelly taste; still, they know that the sugar was there, and would have been very good sugar indeed if it had been screened. Yes, they are pleased; not noisily so, but pleased; invaded, or streaked, as one may say, with little recurrent shivers of joy—subdued joy, so to speak, not the overdone kind. And they commune together, these, and massage each other with comforting sayings, in a sweet spirit of resignation and thankfulness, mixing these elements in the same proportions as the sugar and the sand, as a memorial, and saying, the one to the other and to the interviewer: "It was severe—yes, it was bitterly severe; but oh, how true it was; and it will do us so much good!"

If it isn't Deportment, what is left? It was at this point that I seemed to get on the right track at last. M. Bourget would teach us to know ourselves; that was it: he would reveal us to ourselves. That would be an education. He would explain us to ourselves. Then we should understand ourselves; and after that be able to go on more intelligently.

It seemed a doubtful scheme. He could explain *us* to *him*self—that would be easy. That would be the same as the naturalist explaining the bug to himself. But to explain the bug to the bug—that is a quite different matter. The bug may not know himself perfectly, but he knows himself better than the naturalist can know him, at any rate.

A foreigner can photograph the exteriors of a nation, but I think that that is as far as he can get. I think that no foreigner can report its interior—its soul, its life, its speech, its thought. I think that a knowledge of these things is acquirable in only one way; not two or four or six—*absorption*; years and years of unconscious absorption; years and years of intercourse with the life concerned; of living it, indeed; sharing personally in its shames and prides, its joys and griefs, its loves and hates, its prosperities and re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

verses, its shows and shabbinesses, it deep patriotisms, its whirlwinds of political passion, its adorations—of flag, and heroic dead, and the glory of the national name. Observation? Of what real value is it? One learns peoples through the heart, not the eyes or the intellect.

There is only one expert who is qualified to examine the souls and the life of a people and make a valuable report—the native novelist. This expert is so rare that the most populous country can never have fifteen conspicuously and confessedly competent ones in stock at one time. This native specialist is not qualified to begin work until he has been absorbing during twenty-five years. How much of his competency is derived from conscious "observation"? The amount is so slight that it counts for next to nothing in the equipment. Almost the whole capital of the novelist is the slow accumulation of *un*conscious observation—absorption. The native expert's intentional observation of manners, speech, character, and ways of life can have value, for the native knows what they mean without having to cipher out the meaning. But I should be astonished to see a foreigner get at the right meanings, catch the elusive shades of these subtle things. Even the native novelist becomes a foreigner, with a foreigner's limitations, when he steps from the State whose life is familiar to him into a State whose life he has not lived. Bret Harte got his California and his Californians by unconscious absorption, and put both of them into his tales alive. But when he came from the Pacific to the Atlantic and tried to do Newport life from study—conscious observation—his failure was absolutely monumental. Newport is a disastrous place for the unacclimated observer, evidently.

To return to novel-building. Does the native novelist try to generalize the nation? No, he lays plainly before you the ways and speech and life of a few people grouped in a certain place—his own place—and that is one book. In time, he and his brethren will report to you the life and the people of the whole nation—the life of a group in a New England village; in a New York village; in a Texan village; in an Oregon village; in villages in fifty States and Territories; then the farm-life in fifty States and Territories; a hundred patches of life and groups of people in a dozen widely separated cities. And the Indians will be attended to; and the cowboys; and the gold and silver miners; and the negroes; and the Idiots and Congressmen; and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Irish, the Germans, the Italians, the Swedes, the French, the Chinamen, the Greasers; and the Catholics, the Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, the Baptists, the Spiritualists, the Mormons, the Shakers, the Quakers, the Jews, the Campbellites, the infidels, the Christian Scientists, the Mind-Curists, the Faith-Curists, the train-robbers, the White Caps, then Moonshiners. And when a thousand able novels have been written, *there* you have the soul of the people, the life of the people, the speech of the people; and not anywhere else can these be had. And the shadings of character, manners, feelings, ambitions, will be infinite.

"*The nature of a people* is always of a similar shade in its vices and its virtues, in its frivolities and in its labor. *It is this physiognomy which it is necessary to discover*, and every document is good, from the hall of a casino to the church, from the foibles of a fashionable woman to the suggestions of a revolutionary leader. I am therefore quite sure that this *American soul*, the principal interest and the great object of my voyage, appears behind the records of Newport for those who choose to see it."—*M. Paul Bourget.*

[The italics are mine.] It is a large contract which he has undertaken. "Records" is a pretty poor word there, but I think the use of it is due to hasty translation. In the original the word is *fastes*. I think M. Bourget meant to suggest that he expected to find the great "American soul" secreted behind the *ostentations* of Newport; and that he was going to get it out and examine it, and generalize it, and psychologize it, and make it reveal to him its hidden vast mystery, "the nature of the people" of the United States of America. We have been accused of being a nation addicted to inventing wild schemes. I trust that we shall be allowed to retire to second place now.

There isn't a single human characteristic that can be safely labelled "American." There isn't a single human ambition, or religious trend, or drift of thought, or peculiarity of education, or code of principles, or breed of folly, or style of conversation, or preference for a particular subject for discussion, or form of legs or trunk or head or face or expression or complexion, or gait, or dress, or manners, or disposition, or any other human detail, inside or outside, that can rationally be generalized as "American."

Whenever you have found what seems to be an "American" peculiarity, you have only to cross a frontier or two, or go down

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or up in the social scale, and you perceive that it has disappeared. And you can cross the Atlantic and find it again. There may be a Newport religious drift or sporting drift, or conversational style or complexion, or cut of face, but there are entire empires in America, north, south, east, and west, where you could not find your duplicates. It is the same with everything else which one might propose to call "American." M. Bourget thinks he has found the American Coquette. If he had really found her he would also have found, I am sure, that she was not new, that she exists in other lands in the same forms, and with the same frivolous heart and the same ways and impulses. I think this because I have seen our coquette; I have seen her in life; better still, I have seen her in our novels, and seen her twin in foreign novels. I wish M. Bourget had seen ours. He thought he saw her. And so he applied his System to her. She was a Species. So he gathered a number of samples of what seemed to be her, and put them under his glass, and divided them into groups which he calls "types," and labelled them in his usual scientific way with "formulas"—brief sharp descriptive flashes that make a person blink, sometimes, they are so sudden and vivid. As a rule they are pretty far-fetched, but that is not an important matter; they surprise, they compel admiration, and I notice by some of the comments which his efforts have called forth that they deceive the unwary. Here are a few of the coquette variants which he has grouped and labelled:

THE COLLECTOR.

THE EQUILIBREE.

THE PROFESSIONAL BEAUTY.

THE BLUFFER.

THE GIRL-BOY.

If he had stopped with describing these characters we should have been obliged to believe that they exist; that they exist, and that he has seen them and spoken with them. But he did not stop there; he went further and furnished to us light-throwing samples of their behavior, and also light-throwing samples of their speeches. He entered those things in his notebook without suspicion, he takes them out and delivers them to the world with a candor and simplicity which show that he believed them genuine. They throw altogether too much light. They reveal to the native the origin of his find. I suppose he knows how he came

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to make that novel and captivatiug discovery, by this time. If he does not, any American can tell him—any American to whom he will show his anecdotes. It was "put up" on him, as we say. It was a jest—to be plain, it was a series of frauds. To my mind it was a poor sort of jest, witless and contemptible. The players of it have their reward, such as it is; they have exhibited the fact that whatever they may be, they are not ladies. M. Bourget did not discover a type of coquette; he merely discovered a type of practical joker. One may say *the* type of practical joker, for these people are exactly alike all over the world. Their equipment is always the same: a vulgar mind, a puerile wit, a cruel disposition as a rule, and always the spirit of treachery.

In his Chapter IV. M. Bourget has two or three columns gravely devoted to the collating and examining and psychologizing of these sorry little frauds. One is not moved to laugh. There is nothing funny in the situation; it is only pathetic. The stranger gave those people his confidence, and they dishonorably treated him in return.

But one must be allowed to suspect that M. Bourget was a little to blame himself. Even a practical joker has some little judgment. He has to exercise some degree of sagacity in selecting his prey, if he would save himself from getting into trouble. In my time I have seldom seen such daring things marketed at any price as these conscienceless folk have worked off at par on this confiding observer. It compels the conviction that there was something about him that bred in those speculators a quite unusual sense of safety, and encouraged them to strain their powers in his behalf. They seem to have satisfied themselves that all he wanted was "significant" facts, and that he was not accustomed to examine the source whence they proceeded. It is plain that there was a sort of conspiracy against him almost from the start—a conspiracy to freight him up with all the strange extravagances those people's decayed brains could invent.

The lengths to which they went are next to incredible. They told him things which surely would have excited any one else's suspicion, but they did not excite his. Consider this:

"*There is not in all the United States an entirely nude statue.*"

If an angel should come down and say such a thing about heaven, a reasonably cautious observer would take that angel's number and inquire a little further before he added it to his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

catch. What does the present observer do? Adds it. Adds it at once. Adds it, and labels it with this innocent comment:

"This small fact is strangely significant."

It does seem to me that this kind of observing is defective.

Here is another curiosity which some liberal person made him a present of. I should think it ought to have disturbed the deep slumber of his suspicion a little, but it didn't. It was a note from a fog-horn for strenuousness, it seems to me, but the doomed voyager did not catch it. If he had but caught it, it would have saved him from several disasters:

"If the American knows that you are travelling to take notes, he is interested in it, and at the same time rejoices in it, as in a tribute."

Again, this is defective observation. It is human to like to be praised; one can even notice it in the French. But it is not human to like to be ridiculed, even when it comes in the form of a "tribute." I think a little psychologizing ought to have come in there. Something like this: A dog does not like to be ridiculed, a redskin does not like to be ridiculed, a negro does not like to be ridiculed, a Chinaman does not like to be ridiculed; let us deduce from these significant facts this formula: the American's grade being higher than these, and the chain of argument stretching unbroken all the way up to him, there is room for suspicion that the person who said the American likes to be ridiculed, and regards it as a tribute, is not a capable observer.

I feel persuaded that in the matter of psychologizing, a professional is too apt to yield to the fascinations of the loftier regions of that great art, to the neglect of its lowlier walks. Every now and then, at half-hour intervals, M. Bourget collects a hatful of airy inaccuracies and dissolves them in a panful of assorted abstractions, and runs the charge into a mould and turns you out a compact principle which will explain an American girl, or an American woman, or why new people yearn for old things, or any other impossible riddle which a person wants answered.

It seems to be conceded that there are a few human peculiarities that can be generalized and located here and there in the world and named by the name of the nation where they are found. I wonder what they are. Perhaps one of them is temperament. One speaks of French vivacity and German gravity and English stubbornness. There is no American temperament. The nearest that one can come at it is to say there are two—the composed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

northern and the impetuous southern; and both are found in other countries. Morals? Purity of women may fairly be called universal with us, but that is the case in some other countries. We have no monopoly of it; it cannot be named American. I think that there is but a single specialty with us, only one thing that can be called by the wide name "American." That is the national devotion to ice-water. All Germans drink beer, but the British nation drinks beer, too; so neither of those peoples is *the* beer-drinking nation. I suppose we do stand alone in having a drink that nobody likes but ourselves. When we have been a month in Europe we lose our craving for it, and we finally tell the hotel folk that they needn't provide it any more. Yet we hardly touch our native shore again, winter or summer, before we are eager for it. The reasons for this state of things have not been psychologized yet. I drop the hint and say no more.

It is my belief that there are some "national" traits and things scattered about the world that are mere superstitions, frauds that have lived so long that they have the solid look of facts. One of them is the dogma that the French are the only chaste people in the world. Ever since I arrived in France this last time I have been accumulating doubts about that; and before I leave this sunny land again I will gather in a few random statistics and psychologize the plausibilities out of it. If people are to come over to America and find fault with our girls and our women, and psychologize every little thing they do, and try to teach them how to behave, and how to cultivate themselves up to where one cannot tell them from the French model, I intend to find out whether those missionaries are qualified or not. A nation ought always to examine into this detail before engaging the teacher for good. This last one has let fall a remark which renewed those doubts of mine when I read it:

> "In our high Parisian existence, for instance, we find applied to arts and luxury, and to debauchery, all the powers and all the weaknesses of the French soul."

You see it amounts to a trade with the French soul; a profession; a science; the serious business of life, so to speak, in our high Parisian existence. I do not quite like the look of it. I question if it can be taught with profit in our country, except of course to those pathetic, neglected minds that are waiting there so yearningly for the education which M. Bourget is going to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

furnish them from the serene summits of our high Parisian life.

I spoke a moment ago of the existence of some superstitions that have been parading the world as facts this long time. For instance, consider the Dollar. The world seems to think that the love of money is "American"; and that the mad desire to get suddenly rich is "American." I believe that both of these things are merely and broadly human, not American monopolies at all. The love of money is natural to all nations, for money is a good and strong friend. I think that this love has existed everywhere, ever since the Bible called it the root of all evil.

I think that the reason why we Americans seem to be so addicted to trying to get rich suddenly is merely because the *opportunity* to make promising efforts in that direction has offered itself to us with a frequency out of all proportion to the European experience. For eighty years this opportunity has been offering itself in one new town or region after another straight westward, step by step, all the way from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific. When a mechanic could buy ten town lots on tolerably long credit for ten months' savings out of his wages, and reasonably expect to sell them in a couple of years for ten times what he gave for them, it was human for him to try the venture, and he did it, no matter what his nationality was. He would have done it in Europe or China if he had had the same chance.

In the flush times in the silver regions, a cook or any other humble worker stood a very good chance to get rich out of a trifle of money risked in a stock deal; and that person promptly took that risk, no matter what his or her nationality might be. I was there, and saw it.

But these opportunities have not been plenty in our Southern States; so there you have a prodigious region where the rush for sudden wealth is almost an unknown thing—and has been, from the beginning.

Europe has offered few opportunities for poor Tom, Dick, and Harry; but when she has offered one, there has been no noticeable difference between European eagerness and American. England saw this in the wild days of the Railroad King; France saw it in 1720—time of Law and the Mississippi Bubble. I am sure I have never seen in the gold and silver mines any madness, fury, frenzy to get suddenly rich which was even remotely comparable to that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which raged in France in the Bubble day. If I had a cyclopædia here I could turn to that memorable case, and satisfy nearly anybody that the hunger for the sudden dollar is no more "American" than it is French. And if I could furnish an American opportunity to staid Germany, I think I could wake her up like a house afire.

But I must return to the Generalizations, Psychologizings, Deductions. When M. Bourget is exploiting these arts, it is then that he is peculiarly and particularly himself. His ways are wholly original when he encounters a trait or a custom which is new to him. Another person would merely examine the find, verify it, estimate its value, and let it go; but that is not sufficient for M. Bourget: he always wants to know *why* that thing exists, he wants to know how it came to happen; and he will not let go of it until he has found out. And in every instance he will find that reason where no one but himself would have thought of looking for it. He does not seem to care for a reason that is not picturesquely located; one might almost say picturesquely and impossibly located.

He found out that in America men do not try to hunt down young married women. At once, as usual, he wanted to know *why*. Any one could have told him. He could have divined it by the lights thrown by the novels of the country. But no, he preferred to find out for himself. He has a trustfulness as regards men and facts which is fine and unusual; he is not particular about the source of a fact, he is not particular about the character and standing of the fact itself; but when it comes to pounding out the reason for the existence of the fact, he will trust no one but himself.

In the present instance here was his fact: American young married women are not pursued by the corruptor; and here was the question: What is it that protects her?

It seems quite unlikely that that problem could have offered difficulties to any but a trained philosopher. Nearly any person would have said to M. Bourget: "Oh, that is very simple. It is very seldom in America that a marriage is made on a commercial basis; our marriages, from the beginning, have been made for love; and where love is there is no room for the corruptor."

Now, it is interesting to see the formidable way in which M.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bourget went at that poor, humble little thing. He moved upon it in column—three columns—and with artillery.

"Two reasons of a very different kind explain"—that fact.

And now that I have got so far, I am almost afraid to say what his two reasons are, lest I be charged with inventing them. But I will not retreat now; I will condense them and print them, giving my word that I am honest, and not trying to deceive any one.

1. Young married women are protected from the approaches of the seducer in New England and vicinity by the diluted remains of a prudence created by a Puritan law of two hundred years ago, which for a while punished adultery with death.

2. And young married women of the other forty or fifty States are protected by laws which afford extraordinary facilities for divorce.

If I have not lost my mind I have accurately conveyed those two Vesuvian irruptions of philosophy. But the reader can consult Chapter IV. of *Outre-Mer* and decide for himself. Let us examine this paralyzing Deduction or Explanation by the light of a few sane facts.

1. This universality of "protection" has existed in our country *from the beginning*; before the death penalty existed in New England, and during all the generations that have dragged by since it was annulled.

2. Extraordinary facilities for divorce are of such recent creation that any middle-aged American can remember a time when such things had not yet been thought of.

Let us suppose that the first easy divorce law went into effect forty years ago, and got noised around and fairly started in business thirty-five years ago, when we had, say, 25,000,000 of white population. Let us suppose that among 5,000,000 of them the young married women were "protected" by the surviving shudder of that ancient Puritan scare—what is M. Bourget going to do about those who lived among the 20,000,000? They were clean in their morals, they were pure, yet there was no easy divorce law to protect them.

Awhile ago I said that M. Bourget's method of truth-seeking—hunting for it in out-of-the-way places—was new; but that was an error. I remember that when Leverrier discovered the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Milky Way, he and the other astronomers began to theorize about it in substantially the same fashion which M. Bourget employs in his reasonings about American social facts and their origin. Leverrier advanced the hypothesis that the Milky Way was caused by gaseous protoplasmic emanations from the field of Waterloo, which, ascending to an altitude determinable by their own specific gravity, became luminous through the development and exposure—by the natural processes of animal decay—of the phosphorus contained in them.

This theory was warmly complimented by Ptolemy, who, however, after much thought and research, decided that he could not accept it as final. His own theory was that the Milky Way was an emigration of lightning-bugs; and he supported and re-enforced this theorem by the well-known fact that the locusts do like that in Egypt.

Giordano Bruno also was outspoken in his praises of Leverrier's important contribution to astronomical science, and was at first inclined to regard it as conclusive, but later, conceiving it to be erroneous, he pronounced against it, and advanced the hypothenuse that the Milky Way was a detachment or corps of stars which became arrested and held in *suspenso suspensorum* by refraction of gravitation while on the march to join their several constellations; a proposition for which he was afterward burned at the stake in Jacksonville, Illinois.

These were all brilliant and picturesque theories, and each was received with enthusiasm by the scientific world; but when a New England farmer, who was not a thinker, but only a plain sort of person who tried to account for large facts in simple ways, came out with the opinion that the Milky Way was just common, ordinary stars and was put where it was because God "wanted to hev it so," the admirable idea fell perfectly flat.

As a literary artist, M. Bourget is as fresh and striking as he is as a scientific one. He says, "Above all, I do not believe much in anecdotes." Why? "In history they are all false"—a sufficiently broad statement—"in literature all libellous"—also a sufficiently sweeping statement, coming from a critic who notes that we are a people who are peculiarly extravagant in our language—"and when it is a matter of social life, almost all biassed." It seems to amount to stultification, almost. He has built two or three breeds of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American coquettes out of anecdotes—mainly "biassed" ones, I suppose; and, as they occur "in literature," furnished by his pen, they must be "all libellous." Or did he mean not *in* literature or anecdotes *about* literature or literary people? I am not able to answer that. Perhaps the original would be clearer, but I have only the translation of this instalment by me. I think the remark had an intention; also that this intention was booked for the trip; but that either in the hurry of the remark's departure it got left, or in the confusion of changing cars at the translator's frontier it got sidetracked.

"But on the other hand I believe in statistics; and those on divorces appear to me to be most conclusive." And he sets himself the task of explaining—in a couple of columns—the process by which Easy-Divorce conceived, invented, originated, developed, and perfected an empire-embracing condition of sexual purity in the States. *In 40 years.* No, he doesn't state the interval. With all his passion for statistics he forgot to ask how long it took to produce this gigantic miracle.

I have followed his pleasant but devious trail through those columns, but I was not able to get hold of his argument and find out what it was. I was not even able to find out where it left off. It seemed to gradually dissolve and flow off into other matters. I followed it with interest, for I was anxious to learn how easy-divorce eradicated adultery in America, but I was disappointed; I have no idea yet, how it did it. I only know it didn't. But that is not valuable; I knew it before.

Well, humor is the great thing, the saving thing, after all. The minute it crops up, all our hardnesses yield, all our irritations and resentments flit away, and a sunny spirit takes their place. And so, when M. Bourget said that bright thing about our grandfathers, I broke all up. I remember exploding its American counter-mine once, under that grand hero, Napoleon. He was only First Consul then, and I was Consul-General—for the United States, of course; but we were very intimate, notwithstanding the difference in rank, for I waived that. One day something offered the opening, and he said:

"Well, General, I suppose life can never get entirely dull to an American, because whenever he can't strike up any other way to put in his time he can always get away with a few years trying to find out who his grandfather was!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I fairly shouted, for I had never heard it sound better; and then I was back at him as quick as a flash—

"Right, your Excellency! But I reckon a Frenchman's got *his* little stand-by for a dull time, too; because when all other interests fail he can turn in and see if he can't find out who his father was!"

Well, you should have heard him just whoop, and cackle, and carry on! He reached up and hit me one on the shoulder, and says—

"Land, but it's good! It's im-mensely good! I'George, I never heard it said so good in my life before! Say it again."

So I said it again, and he said his again, and I said mine again, and then he did, and then I did, and then he did, and we kept on doing it, and doing it, and I *never* had such a good time, and he said the same. In my opinion there isn't anything that is as killing as one of those dear old ripe pensioners if you know how to snatch it out in a kind of a fresh sort of original way.

But I wish M. Bourget had read more of our novels before he came. It is the only way to thoroughly understand a people. When I found I was coming to Paris, I read *La Terre*.

MARK TWAIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR TRADE WITH CHINA.

BY THE CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF STATISTICS AT WASHINGTON.

For centuries the East has remained an unsolved problem in commerce and industry. After six hundred years of intercourse through commercial companies, monopolies, and distant diplomatic relations, its commerce with other countries has remained as fixed in nature as are the habits and customs of the people. From the very beginning its trade assumed a crystallized form; and on the whole the only changes that have occurred have been an increase in the size of the crystals, and not a change in their nature or composition. Whatever modification the trade of China has endured has been caused by the progress and industrial development of other nations, not of itself. Tea and silk were the principal articles traded in by the East India Company of the seventeenth century; tea and silk are the leading commodities of Chinese trade to-day, contributing more than one-half of the total export. While other nations of Asia have under foreign influence modified their productions and in consequence their trade, China has remained fixed, merely reflecting the advance in wealth of such people as consume her peculiar products. Such a situation in the nineteenth century is remarkable, and China has long been a by-word among civilized nations for all that is backward, and for a pig-headed opposition to progress.

The capacity to compete in production is best gauged by the conditions of a free market, unaffected by discriminating duties, or conditions other than are necessary to the conduct of commerce. London is such a market, and furnishes a means of gauging roughly the relative advantages or disadvantages favoring or weighing upon a product of reasonably uniform composition. Such a product is tea. No matter whence it may be imported the duty is the same, fourpence a pound. The principal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sources of supply are China, British India, and Ceylon, the last two being British colonial possessions. In 1893 the importation from all sources were 249,546,451 pounds, of which 194,072,353 pounds came from British possessions. Of this total 208,098,004 pounds entered into consumption in the United Kingdom, and were derived from the following sources:

	Pounds.
From British East Indies	108,143,599
From Ceylon	64,218,062
From China	32,060,079
From other countries	3,676,264

If we go back for ten years an experience of peculiar interest is developed.

From 1884 to 1893 the imports from British India increased by 44,936,000 pounds, or 71 per cent.; from Ceylon by 61,997,000 pounds, or 2,804 per cent.; and from China decreased 111,711,000 pounds, or 77 per cent.

This supercession of Chinese by British Indian teas is not to be attributed to any advantage in price. In 1883 the import price as returned by the English Board of Trade was 15 pence for Indian and 11.4 pence for Chinese, a difference against India of 24 per cent. In 1892 the import prices were 10.3 pence for Indian and 8.7 pence for Chinese, a difference of 15½ per cent. in favor of the Chinese article. The world's consumption of tea is estimated at somewhere near 443,000,000 pounds a year, and of this about one-half is supplied by British India. The fact, however, that competition is not only possible but highly successful in the face of conditions which economically would seem to discourage it, is a very hopeful sign. It is even more hopeful than the lessons to be drawn from the cultivation of beet sugar in competition with the cane product. In that case the artificial aid of a bounty acted as a stimulus, enabling the farmers of Europe to compete with the cheap and shiftless labor of the West Indies.

There is another product of China which has become in recent years of some importance in the trade returns of the United States—sheep's wool. In 1893 we received from China 20,744,689 pounds of wool, raw, of a value of $1,811,427. The first import of more than a million pounds was made in 1884. Since then it has increased rapidly: 1,037,000 pounds in 1884; 5,745,000 pounds in 1889; 10,624,000 pounds in 1891; and 20,745,000 pounds in 1893. This wool all comes from the northern provinces of China, and the United States takes almost the entire export. The price

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tells the whole story. The valuation at the Chinese custom-house in 1893 averaged 6.6 cents a pound, which means a very low grade of wool—in fact, nothing but the cheapest grade of carpet wool. It is obtained in the remote regions of Mongolia, the province of Kan-Soo, and northern Thibet. It is brought on camels, and no care in sorting or packing is shown, and dirt and sand freely mix with it. The ball wool comes from Chi-li, and is combed with wide combs from the backs of the sheep, and afterwards twisted up into balls. Other wool is made up into coils for convenience of transporting to the seaboard, and is known as rope wool. Under such primitive conditions it is difficult to imagine a successful competition in the world's market, and it is only the comparatively recent demand on the part of the United States that has enabled this trade to exist. It is wool such as no other country would take, and, under the peculiar and artificial conditions of our wool market, it has succeeded in awakening the apprehensions of our political shepherds—those people, I mean, who think the United States exists as an appendage to the wool interests. The exclusion of finer grades of raw wool from our market has acted as a bounty upon this almost wool waste of Eastern countries, China, southern Russia, Turkey in Asia, and the Argentine Republic. As our manufacturer may now select, for the first time, the wools he uses, it is doubtful if these cheap wools will have any hold in our markets. It is possible, however, that some attempt may be made to improve the breed in China. A few years ago a number of merino lambs was sent to Mongolia, and not long afterwards the New York customs officials detected the improvement in the wool, and made inquiries whether merino wool, which is a high grade of wool, was exported from Tientsin, the principal port of shipment. Should this practice be followed, wool in China would stand commercially in nearly the same position as wheat in British India. It would not be consumed locally, but be a product for export, and, if of good quality, would be desirable for the American market.

It is not a little comforting to see how powerless the Chinese are to range with other more civilized countries, or with peoples who are adopting more intelligent methods of production and manufacture. Chinese tea is being superseded by the teas of British India and Ceylon; Chinese silk is being crowded out of the American market by the silks of Japan and Italy. The im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ports of Chinese rice are decreasing from year to year, and there is every reason to believe that Chinese wool will no longer have any position in our markets. Wherever the American demand for Chinese products has fallen off, it has been made good by the products of other countries which we rank higher in advancement than the Celestial Empire.

In American exports to China, petroleum stands among the first in importance. In 1870 the exports to China, including Hong Kong and Singapore, of refined petroleum, were 470,187 gallons, of a value of $142,399. In 1894 the exports were 40,377,296 gallons, of a value of $2,435,794. As the total exports to China in the latter year were valued at $5,861,828, it will be seen what an important item petroleum represents. Even in this line of exports we encounter competition from the Russian oil-fields. It was in 1889 that the Chinese customs returns first discriminated between American and Russian oil. In that year the imports of American were 15,000,000 gallons, against 5,655,741 gallons of the Russian oil. In 1893 the imports of American oil had risen to 36,720,382 gallons and the Russian to 13,286,198 gallons. The Russian oil has gained a foothold in the market in spite of a marked difference in quality in favor of the American product. The difference in price is a fraction on the side of the Russian oil, but the difference in quality is a factor on the other side. How close the contest is for this market is illustrated by the increased importation in 1893 over that of 1892. This increase was 9,473,000 gallons. The share contributed by the American oil was 4,836,000 gallons, and Russian 4,637,000 gallons. In the near future this competition will be even more intense, as arrangements are nearly completed for transporting Russian oil in bulk by steamer to be stored in tanks in Shanghai and other ports.

There are only two other articles of exports from the United States to China—cotton-cloths and ginseng. In 1870 we exported 1,631,680 yards of colored cotton and 442,482 yards of uncolored, the total value being 314,087. In 1894 the exports of uncolored cotton to China alone were 50,458,349 yards, of a value of $2,772,065. The export of colored cloths was too small for mention. These figures of 1894 are not the highest reached, 1891 being the banner year, showing an export of 80,674,246 yards. Whatever feeling of exultation such figures might excite is dampened when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we turn to the English exports. In 1893, 365,405,900 yards, representing a value of more than $18,000,000; in 1890 the exports were more than 570,000,000 yards, or more than seven times the highest figures attained by the United States. As the chief producers of the raw material, commanding the most highly developed machinery and an almost unlimited supply of skilled labor, enjoying as cheap means of transport as other countries, it is strange that we have not a greater command over the cotton market of China than we now have. British India is a more important factor in the cotton trade of China than the United States; while the possibility of domestic mills introduces a new factor of disturbance. The latest issue of the imperial maritime customs report says:

"Indications are not wanting that the erection of cotton-mills at ports extending from the Gulf of Tonkin to Chunking is contemplated, and there is abundant evidence of great local activity in that direction. A nation whose inexhaustible supply of laborers excites such alarm among western peoples and governments is not likely to prove less formidable when it brings similar forces of cheap silver-paid skilled operatives into competition with the textile industries of the gold-wage-earning classes of Europe and America, and the effect will be felt more acutely and cause greater consternation than the presence of Chinese labor abroad whenever it comes into rivalry with the handicrafts of occidental races."

Such a possibility is favored by the domestic product of cotton, as gauged by the exports. In 1876 China exported 5,730,000 pounds; in 1893, 76,820,000 pounds.

These two products, petroleum and cotton, account for $5,207,000 out of a total export to China of $5,800,000. The balance is made up of a number of articles, no one of which rises to an importance sufficient to require careful study. Indirectly we send to China an article which no other country takes, ginseng, which goes to Hongkong. The exports in 1893 were $792,928, representing 251,205 pounds. The exports in 1894 were somewhat less, 194,000 pounds, representing a value of $610,000. It is the scarcity of the native product which has given an opening to this export, and, should the cultivation be taken up systematically in the East, the demand for our root would cease. Such is our export trade to China. In the two leading articles, cottons and petroleum, the opportunities for growth and extension would seem to be almost unlimited. Petroleum is superseding the native seed oils, and unless some political agitation arises this increasing demand will be divided between the American and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russian oil interests. I say political, as on more than one occasion the Chinese authorities have threatened to prohibit the import of American oil as a return courtesy for our treatment of Chinese subjects. Though a profitable trade in these days laughs at prohibition, undoubtedly a serious blow could be given to this export, and any such blow would redound to the advantage of our Russian competitor. In the long run it pays to assume an attitude approaching a Christian one towards these eastern nations.

One circumstance must be borne in mind, that China would be willing, nay, glad to have her trade with foreign countries shut off, if not wholly, at least in part. In any commercial contest, therefore, she holds a position of vantage, for far greater injury would be inflicted upon the commerce of Great Britain and America by the cessation of trade than could be experienced by China. In the complex organization of modern commerce, and especially where the trade consists in large exchanges of a few articles, the interests involved are highly sensitive and feel a restriction more keenly and destructively. Our trade with China is of this description. A prohibition on the part of China, or an interruption by war of the exports of tea and silk, would produce a marked temporary derangement in the import of these articles into the United States. The prohibition by China, if we can conceive such a prohibition effective, of imports of petroleum from the United States, would be reflected in the petroleum interest directly, and all allied industries by indirection. No system of differential or discriminating duties, intended to retaliate upon China and Chinese products, or break the force of her prohibition, could be framed. Prohibition on the part of the United States of Chinese products would be mere foolishness. For as it is, a great trade is carried by way of other countries in which the goods often lose their identity as to place of origin.

The conditions in China are so different from those of other countries that it is difficult to conceive a true competition in production. If we could imagine a country divided into nineteen provinces, each province possessing its own regulations of trade, in which extortion, rather than regulation, was the object; possessing no railways, but a highly developed system of canal communication; a post-office conducted by post carts and runners; and a provincial coinage: add to these disadvantages a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

population essentially agricultural, possessing no machinery, nor the knowledge of machinery; having material wants easily satisfied, and living upon as narrow a margin, short of barbarism, as an economic standard will admit; of intense industry, hampered by superstition and a blind adherence to custom and precedent—these are certainly not such conditions as would promise the creation of an industrial and commercial empire at all fitted to compete with our boasted western civilization. Yet it is out of precisely such ingredients that the ablest competitors of the producers of the United States have been developed. Doubtless a great deal of what we call foreign competition is due to our timidity and the belief, generally prevalent among us, that trade must be fostered and protected by the direct intervention of the state. The rise of a foreign commercial or industrial interest of a similar character with any American interest constitutes an excuse for legislative activity in restricting the import of the foreign product. Name over the "scares" experienced in recent years in these lines, and it will be found that they have applied to the product of peoples by no means our equals in civilization, or in capacity for contending with or utilizing natural forces and agents, and of communities essentially agricultural. The wheat of British India and southern Russia, the cotton of Egypt and British India, the wool of China, Australasia, and South America, the petroleum of the Caspian region, the silver of Mexico, and the labor of China, each of these has had its day, and exercised a potent influence in public discussions and in tariff agitation.

It has yet to be determined that any of these products has exerted a permanent influence to the disadvantage of the American interest. It has yet to be proved that American producers, having machinery to back them, have any cause to fear, at present, the destruction of any essential part of their capacity to produce and to market their product. Wool raising stands by itself, as it is naturally more favored in a country where land is yet so cheap that it can be given away, and so sparsely settled as to supply almost unlimited sheep ranges with little cost for maintenance. I say, at present, there is no fear. There are certainly possibilities of the future. At first blush no contest could be more unequal than one between China and Japan. The mere cheapness of life in China would enable their enormous and crushing force of numbers to be thrown upon the weaker power. Yet the smaller

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

body, assisted by the appliances of civilization, controlled by intelligence, has given a result which may profoundly affect the conditions of our western powers.

There is always room for speculation as to what might happen, given an entirely new condition of things. China and Chinese interests have proved a fruitful ground for conjecture, but these conjectures assume a revolution in habits, methods, and beliefs which is almost incredible. We have become so accustomed to gradual change, generally through the slow processes of legislation, with their slower results, as to be beyond the fear of great and sudden alterations for ourselves. Yet we seem to take it for granted that in the East changes greater than have happened within civilized times are liable to occur. A wave of Mongolian invasion forms one of the stock cards of European alarmists, and they picture an overthrow which would recall the conquests and horrors of primitive times, when the brute dominated the nature of man. I set aside any question of an actual transference on a large scale of Eastern populations outside of their proper boundaries, and it is only the probability of a rise of such industrial or even agricultural potency in China as will enable it to compete with us or the countries of Europe that need be considered. The Chinese love labor, and in a measure they recognize the dignity of labor, although it is a dignity with them largely based upon necessity. They have, therefore, one great element needed to produce large economic interests. But they despise commerce, and hate the foreigner in person and in influence; and they have invited war upon war rather than be obliged to come into personal contact with the "foreign devils." The country is rich in natural resources, and it possesses the coal-fields of the world. It is wanting in rapid and cheap means of internal transportation, and one province may starve while a neighboring province overflows with abundance, merely for the want of carriage. In such cases great bodies of the population move from one province to another,—the most primitive form of meeting a natural disaster depriving the people of their supply of food. Ingenious as the people are in many lines, they show a peculiar dislike to machinery and labor-saving implements, and while they form an addition to the productive strength of countries whither they immigrate, as in the Malay peninsula, their social habits keep them distinctly foreign.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We must imagine all this changed. We must picture the introduction of a foreign element, capable of directing the energies of the Chinese into a development of their natural resources, more after the methods and extent of our western civilizations; we must imagine a network of railroads, and this in itself would be an enormous concession, which may open up the interior of the country where the coal deposits are found, and where the productive agents are weightiest. We must imagine the growth of a commercial feeling; and above all, we must assume a government which protects life and property, which does not depend upon extortion for its revenues, and which has a reasonably honest fiscal system. Given such new conditions, and the Chinese would be no longer Chinese. All this is possible. We need only to look to British India, where a race fully as low in the economic scale as the Chinese has become an aggressive factor in the world's markets, under the direction of an energetic commercial and industrial influence. More telling yet we may point to Japan, at one time quite as inefficient economically as the Chinese, to prove the adaptability of the Eastern people under favorable conditions. But all this is improbable, and even if begun within a reasonable time would require years to make its influence felt. It has been shown that, under Chinese methods, Chinese foreign commercial influence is declining. Experience in the past proves it is only at the cannon's mouth that we can obtain concessions enabling us to come within arm's length of this remarkable nation. But it may be that the sharp and severe lesson which Japan has imposed upon the mightier power will lead it to imitate Japan in embracing western knowledge and western methods. Till this lesson is taught it is useless to talk of the terrors of a Mongolian invasion.

WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MILITARY SYSTEMS OF EUROPE AND AMERICA.

BY LIEUT.-COL. WILLIAM LUDLOW, MILITARY ATTACHÉ TO THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY TO THE COURT OF ST. JAMES'S.

THE nineteenth century has been one of unprecedented intellectual and material development, and its close marks the highest level thus far attained by mankind in physical and mental domination. Its most striking phase, perhaps, is the remarkable condition of military preparation in which stand the ruling nations of the world. Europe, which represents the epitome of modern civilization, is practically an armed camp, and its several hosts stand silent in readiness for the trumpet-call, with nerve and sinew strained to meet the shock of international conflict.

It would seem an extraordinary fact, inexplicable upon ethical grounds, that the outcome of centuries of increasing enlightenment and cultivation, among peoples whose avowed creed is Christianity, should be an elaborate preparation for mutual attack and overthrow by force of arms—but the national revenues are heavily taxed for the support of great armaments, and each new development of art and science, each fresh acquisition of knowledge, every mechanical means of which in any direction the world becomes possessed, is seized upon and utilized to secure the maximum of destructive effect, and improve the facilities for cutting each other's throats in the most expeditious and scientific manner.

Four nations occupy the heart of Europe, viz.: Germany, Austria-Hungary, France, and Italy, three of them nearly equal in area and population, while Italy, with half the area, has about three-fourths the average population. The four are compressed into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

close contact, each having in effect a common frontier with two others. Eastward of the group looms the Empire of Russia, whose European possessions alone are nearly three times the combined area of the four, with a population about one-third less. To the northwest lie the British Islands, with a population about equal to that of France, and an area a tenth larger than Italy's, but whose power rests mainly in their great accumulated and industrial wealth and the multiplied channels of trade which connect Great Britain with her numerous and widely distributed colonies and with the world at large.

All these European states have been foes, at one time or other, and whatever the alliances, political and commercial, that have been made from time to time, the ancient animosities have never more than slumbered, ready to awaken at a touch under conditions of nervous tension indicating a very unstable equilibrium.

The military history and successes of Germany have easily made her the war school of Europe, and the scientific development of the military art, to which she is indebted for the overthrow of Austria and France in her later wars, has compelled the others to follow her example and imitate her methods even to the particulars of organization and equipment, though unable probably to rival her in systematic thoroughness of preparation and sustained attention to detail.

The system evolved by Germany and now substantially common to all the continental states is as a whole simple enough, and has for its practical object the conversion, so far as may be, of the entire nation into a military body with the largest amount of training that the finances and other public exigencies will permit.

The controlling principles may be summarized as follows:

1. Liability to service universal, and actual service compulsory at the discretion of the state.

2. The thorough training and maintenance under arms in readiness for immediate service of as large a force as practicable.

3. A secure simplicity and perfection of organization and equipment in every particular, large and small.

4. The formation, as rapidly as may be, of a regular reserve, from which the active ranks can be at once expanded from a peace to a war footing with fully trained men.

5. The formation and partial training of a militia, which, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the absence of the regular troops, is to occupy garrisons and forts, construct defences, maintain order at home, and supply the waste of war by filling vacancies in the field.

6. The enrolment of every citizen into a force that may be levied *en masse* in case of invasion.

7. Careful study and solution, in advance, of every possible military complication, in order that prompt and concerted action shall follow a declaration of war.

By the law of the land every male citizen is liable to service, no substitution is allowed, and each on attaining 21 years of age must present himself for physical examination and enrolment. Not all are taken. The physically and morally unfit are rejected, the best selected in such number as may be required, and the remainder relegated to a reserve, while still subject to partial drill and instruction.

The standing army proper, composed of the flower of the national youth, requires a service of 7 years, of which 2 or 3 are "with the colors" for thorough instruction and practice in the soldier's trade, and the subsequent 4 or 5 with the "Reserve" where the soldier is permitted to engage in other occupations, although required to keep up his instruction by occasional participation with the active force, and at all times to hold himself in readiness to respond to a summons.

From the regular reserve the soldier passes at the age of 27 to a second reserve, termed in Germany the Landwehr, which is divided into two classes, the first of 5 years' service, the second of 7 years more, or until the soldier reaches the age of 39.

The young men not taken into regular service at the outset are assigned to a species of militia, in which they must serve, for 12 years, with periodic drills, or may join the regular forces as volunteers for purpose of instruction. Back of these several organizations is the great body of untrained or partly trained militia termed in Germany the Landsturm, consisting of every able-bodied man between 17 and 45 not enrolled in the army or reserves. The Landsturm is also divided into classes 1 and 2, according to age, and, as a body, is only to be called into active service in case of invasion.

In order to expedite the training of larger numbers for the regular reserve and thus keep pace with an impending increase in the French Army, the German law of 1893 reduced the period of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

service "with the colors" for the infantry from three to two years, so that the successive levies might the more rapidly be passed through the military mill, and the annual supply of about 300,000 youth of 21 be as largely as possible converted into soldiers.

The direct command of the army is vested in the Sovereign, who is personally the Commander-in-Chief, and to whom every man takes oath of unconditional fealty and obedience. The Corps Commanders report direct to and receive their orders from him.

The General Staff works assiduously at collecting information, studying war problems, devising improvements, bettering the administration and directing the instruction of the line officers, who themselves are industriously engaged from morning to night in the drilling, training, and physical and mental education of their men. Endeavor is made to insure the efficiency of the army for every military task and its complete readiness to meet or attack an enemy in any quarter. Plans of campaigns in great variety are worked out and scheduled, and the individual commanders confidentially instructed as to what each is to do, and on announcement of war the German Army can be mobilized, *i. e.*, put in active service, within a week fully equipped.

The general organization and sub-divisions of this force, as representing the result of mature experience and keen study, may be briefly described.

The army is divided into twenty-one separate "corps," each combining a due proportion of all arms, and capable of acting as an independent military unit, which in time of peace occupies its own territorial district, and keeps its ranks supplied from the local annual levies.

A corps consists of: (a) 2 "line divisions"; (b) a horse artillery division of 2 batteries of 6 guns each; (c) a field artillery division of 4 batteries; and (d) a sanitary detachment.

A "line division" consists of: (a) 2 brigades of infantry; (b) a field division of artillery of 4 batteries; (c) a regiment of cavalry; (d) 1 or 2 companies of engineers; and (e) a sanitary detachment.

A "brigade of infantry" consists of 2 regiments: a regiment of 3 battalions; a battalion of 4 companies.

The strength of each company is, on a peace footing, 135 men; in war, 250. A battalion, therefore, represents in peace 540 men,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in war, 1,000. A regiment contains 1,260 and 3,000, and a corps about 16,000 and 30,000.

The four divisions of artillery in each corps constitute an "artillery regiment" of the same numerical designation as that of the corps; and it may be noted that the cavalry is at all times maintained on its full war footing in readiness to take the field at once, in advance of the filling up and mobilization of the war ranks.

The relative proportions of the several arms are about as follows: General staff, staff and non-regimental, miscellaneous, 2½ per cent.; engineers, pioneers, bridge, balloon, railway, and telegraph services, 2½ per cent.; artillery, 14 per cent.; cavalry, 13 per cent.; and infantry, 68 per cent. So that the fighting force of an army of 500,000, including, say, 20,000 officers, would be, in round numbers: Staff and miscellaneous, 12,500; engineers, etc., 12,500; artillery, 68,000; cavalry, 67,000; and infantry, 340,000: with, say, 2,700 guns and 100,000 horses.

The following table gives the area, population, and military strength of each of the six leading European states, with the corresponding data for the United States for comparison:

	Area, sq. m.	Population.	Military Strength.	
			Peace.	War.
Germany	208,738	50,000,000	584,518	2,700,000
France	204,092	39,000,000	523,755	2,715,570
Austria-Hungary	261,649	43,500,000	299,150	1,590,820
Italy	110,623	31,500,000	247,228	1,909,000
Russia in Europe	2,095,000	110,000,000	977,500	2,722,400
Great Britain	121,973	40,000,000	*220,509	700,000
U. S. America	3,581,000	65,000,000	25,900 Regulars 112,000 Militia	

*The British peace strength includes 76,721 in India.

Needless to say this maintenance of a swollen military force, ceaseless vigilance, and untiring energy of preparation must be paid for, and roundly. With the exercise of the most rigid economy, short of weakening her equipment, Germany lays out about $160,000,000 annually for military expenditure on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

army and navy—considerably over one-third her entire revenue. France, a much richer country, but burdened with the hugest load of debt ever known, pays $180,000,000; and Italy, already crushed under the weight of her public obligations, pays $80,000,000; Austria-Hungary about the same. Great Britain, with larger resources than any of the others, and relatively isolated from territorial contact, but whose necessity for maintaining her hold on India and the command of the sea for the protection of her commerce, which is more than half the tonnage of the world, compels her to rival the others in military readiness, expends annually $160,000,000 on her army and navy —about one-third her gross revenue.

It should be noted, however, that Great Britain has not adopted the plan of universal and enforced service, nor, in view of her special requirements, is the organization the same. The English regiments are maintained by voluntary enlistments, and the English Army is practically the training-school and recruiting-depot for the British Army in India, to which annual drafts are sent, and where 77,000 men are maintained in active service, in addition to native contingents numbering 140,000.

To the actual outlay in money by the European states should be added the incidental cost of the withdrawal from profitable occupation and the maintenance in economic idleness of these huge armies of 200,000 to 1,000,000 men at the period of their greatest activity and productive power; and as a man in full vigor of mind and body can hardly be worth less than double the actual cost of supporting him, it will be seen that the annual expenditure may be multiplied by three to reach a total representing the ultimate cost of the military conditions existing in Europe. As a partial offset to this, however, may be set down the influence of this armed strength in the maintenance of internal order and the repression of turbulent elements, which, if permitted to make head, would disturb the peace and might even threaten the stability of the State. It is possible that in some cases at least considerations of this kind, conjoined with the general apprehension of hostile designs on the part of their neighbors, may account for the seeming willingness of the several peoples, through their national legislatures, to endure the continuance of large expenditure for military purposes.

What shall be the history of these armaments remains to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seen. Whether Europe is to be again convulsed by a combat of giants, which, if it occur, will involve the ruin of some nations and important readjustments affecting all, and creating new and deeper heartburnings,—or whether the armies will eventually be peacefully disbanded in accordance with a developed general conviction that such is the rational and civilized thing to do,—only the future can disclose. The responsible rulers do not hesitate to avow their earnest determination, if possible, to keep the peace, while insisting that the best guarantee of it is complete readiness for war. If the balance can be maintained, and the existing conditions of supersensitiveness do not precipitate a conflict, it seems probable that in time, an enlightened public opinion may control events and solve the problem.

The military strength of the United States as represented by its armed forces is in marked contrast with those of the nations of Europe.

With an area exceeding all of them combined and a civilized population greater than any, contained within its own frontiers; without isolated possessions needing defence, or the policy that would acquire them; creating no enmities, cultivating relations of friendliness with its neighbors on the north and south; with a wealth of resource and military aptitude making it too formidable to be attacked—the situation is one entirely suggestive of peace, and the rapidly increasing population is left free to devote itself to industrial and commercial pursuits, with neither necessity nor justification for the maintenance of an exaggerated armament.

While in no sense quarrelsome or combative, the race has shown itself possessed of a military spirit and capacity which, evoked and dominated by an intelligent and patriotic faith in itself and its future, have always proved equal to the emergency, however grave, and carried its contests to a successful issue.

With the conclusion of the Civil War in 1865 the armies were promptly disbanded and the military establishment put upon that moderate peace footing that appeared at the time to be sufficient.

The main uses for an army then were the occupation of some of the more important points on the seaboard and frontiers, but more particularly of numerous interior points, for the control of the wilder Indian tribes, whose fondness for war, natural fierceness, and reliance upon hunting made them restive under the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gradual enroachments of the white settlers, and caused frequent outbreaks of greater or less seriousness.

By Acts of Congress the enlisted force of the Regular Army is limited to 25,000, and the general organization is substantially as indicated in the following table:

	Officers.	Men.
General officers and General Staff depts	391	
Corps of engineers	121	500
Ordnance Dept	58	485
10 regts. of cavalry	432	6,050
5 " " artillery	280	3,675
25 " " infantry	877	12,125
Non-com. staff, unattached men, scouts, etc		2,165
Totals	2,159	25,000

In addition are various enlisted men, general service clerks, and messengers, hospital attendants, etc., not included in the 25,000, numbering about 1,400, and bringing the total enlisted to 26,383, and the aggregate of all ranks to 28,542.

The organization of the several arms is as follows:

A regiment of cavalry consists of 12 "troops," each having three officers and 60 men. At present two troops in each regiment are not filled, retaining only a skeleton organization. A regiment, therefore, now contains 44 officers and 605 men.

A regiment of artillery consists of 12 "batteries"—10 foot and 2 mounted; each foot battery has 4 officers and 60 men and a mounted battery has 5 officers and 65 men. The regiment, therefore, contains 56 officers and 735 men.

A regiment of infantry consists of 10 "companies," each having 3 officers and 60 men. As in the cavalry, 2 companies in each regiment are skeletons, and the regiment, therefore, contains 36 officers and 485 men.

The engineer battalion is divided into four companies, with three officers each. Two companies have 133 men, one has 132, and one has 100. The battalion therefore contains 16 officers and 500 men.

The ordnance detachment of 485 men is generally distributed at the arsenals and employed as guards.

The general officers of the line are nine in number, three major-generals and six brigadiers—and for the purpose of distribution and command of the troops the country is divided into eight territorial departments, each with a general officer in com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mand, the senior major-general commanding the army with headquarters at Washington. The troops are stationed all over the country at military posts numbering about 100, leaving some 40 posts, mainly on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, unoccupied. As the necessity of guarding a large area from Indian outbreaks has disappeared, the troops are by degrees in process of concentration in the vicinity of critical points, which may in general be considered the leading commercial ports and large interior centres of population—but it is evident that, with an effective force not exceeding 22,500, but few garrisons of even 1,000 men can be maintained.

Were it a serious question of resisting attack or of maintaining internal peace, such a force, required to distribute itself over the entire area of the United States, would be manifestly inadequate.

The staff departments proper are 7 in number, with personnel as follows: Adjutant-generals, 17; inspector-generals, 7; judge-advocate-generals, 8; quartermasters, 59; subsistence, 26; medical, 193; and pay, 31.

The duties of these several departments are in general sufficiently indicated by their designations, with the exception, perhaps, of the quartermasters, who have to do not only with barracks, quarters, and grounds, but with a great variety of other matters, including transportation, fuel, forage, clothing, camp and garrison equipage, purchase of public animals, care of national cemeteries, etc.

Each staff department with headquarters at Washington conducts its business independently of the others, under the immediate supervision of its own chief and the general direction of the Secretary of War. A representative of each department is stationed at the headquarters of the territorial departments, who directs the duties of his subordinates at minor points.

In the case of the quartermasters and subsistence departments, each in addition to its own personnel, usually stationed at the more important points, has a representative at every garrison—usually a line officer detailed for both duties.

In all the departments endeavor is made so to regulate and systematize the methods of administration, including reports, returns, and money and property accounting, as to make them effective and easy of comprehension, in order that, should the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

employment of a large force become necessary, the organization might be almost indefinitely expanded, without confusion or failure.

The American private soldier enlists for three years, and may re-enlist for corresponding periods while acceptable for service. He receives from $13 to $18 per month in addition to his rations, clothing, bedding, housing, and medical attendance; his compensation aggregating considerably more than double that given in the British service.

The total annual cost of the military establishment is about $37,000,000.

In addition to the Regular Army the United States laws make provision for the organization of a militia, which, generally designated as a National Guard, is the creation of each State, and under the control and regulation of the State authorities, with the governor as its administrative chief, but is subject to be called into the service of the United States at the summons of the President when, in his judgment, such action is necessary.

Each State is supposed to enroll its able-bodied males between the ages of eighteen and forty-five, and according to the Census of 1890 the total of these was some 13,000,000, which, allowing for necessary and proper exemptions, would furnish about 9,000,000 or 10,000,000 as liable to military duty. Of these the actually organized force numbers about 112,000, only a little over one per cent., and not only does the militia of the several States vary in numbers according to population and other considerations, but in still greater degree in the training and efficiency of its individual organizations, from a standard of discipline and drill that approximates to that of regular troops to the veriest travesty of an armed force.

Improvement more or less is annually made, according to the spirit of the community to which they pertain, the energy and loyalty of the officers and the intelligence and interest of the State authorities, but the showing as a whole is not encouraging.

The policy of the Federal Government has been to aid the development of the militia—both by annual appropriations of $400,000 for the procurement of arms and munitions, and by furthering a greater degree of association between the regular and State forces. For this purpose the two are sometimes conjoined in camps of instruction, regular officers are detailed on the staff

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the governors, and others assigned to inspect and report upon State organizations.

A further service, possibly even more useful, is the detailing of regular officers as military instructors at colleges where the students can be organized as a battalion for drill and instruction and attend lectures on military and cognate subjects, in order that at the age when the deepest and most lasting impressions can be made and the character moulded, a knowledge of and liking for military service can be inculcated. Military training, physical and moral, is valuable *per se*, and it would be well if every citizen could be taught to bear arms and use them scientifically.

The physical development—the all-round training of the body, the habit of self-reliance as well as of combined action, the straightforward set of head and eye and the squareness of shoulder, with which are correlated directness of speech, promptness of action, and integrity of character, self-respect and respect for others, self-restraint and the practice of a becoming obedience to law, respectful demeanor to those above and about one, and consideration and kindness to those below,—these are all military attributes with which every citizen may profitably seek to endow himself, but after all is said and done a man cannot be trained to be a soldier save in the school of actual service. No perfection of drill or manual, be they practised as often as every week, and supplemented by regimental drills, street parades, and even a week every year in a camp of instruction, can accomplish this transformation. Time and the unintermitted habit of years are necessary for the man to absorb that single idea of devotion to duty and to duty alone—to the disregard and sacrifice, if need be, of every other consideration—that constitutes the fundamental characteristic of the soldier, and differentiates him from the armed citizen.

Our people learned this lesson in the arduous work of 1860-4, but that was 30 years ago, and the lesson is in danger of being entirely unknown to the coming generation and that now on the stage. While, therefore, it is desirable that every citizen, so far as may be, without undue interference with his pursuits, business or professional, should be taught a soldier's trade, it cannot be expected that he shall follow it to the extent that is necessary if in all circumstances he is to be found equal to every emergency.

That is the affair of the professional soldier—who makes it his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lifework and knows no other—who, with a mind free from other claim or preoccupation, gives all his time and all his energy, physical, moral, and mental, to the training of himself and of the men for whom he is responsible—in the career which he has chosen, and which admits of no divided sovereignty.

The function of a government, aside from the national defence, is to maintain order, enforce obedience to law, and to safeguard the lives, property, and personal liberties of its citizens—and the great achievement that has been wrought in America under our form of government is the assimilation of a horde of immigrants representing peoples of every race and every shade of moral and social proclivities, into a distinctive American nation, which, following its inherited and instinctive Anglo-Saxon love of justice and insistence on personal rights, has pervaded the entire composite mass with its own convictions, and formed it into a homogeneous and consistently law-abiding community. If there be still found elements not fully digested, and if these have been able to impart to certain classes a mistaken impatience of and resentment against the conservative legal restraints needful for the general order, the reasons may be sought, first, in the indiscriminating welcome given to all—even those escaping from the consequences of criminal attempts and purposes in their own countries—and, secondly, in the superfluous measure of toleration with which such sources of irritation have been treated.

To be worthy of respect a government should be able to command it, and, since preservation of order is the object to be attained, there is needed so much of an organized force at the disposal of the government as should be able not only to restore peace, but to forbid its breach ; and a nation that would relegate the maintenance of order to casual and insufficient means puts itself in the attitude of a city that, dispensing with a trained police, should intrust its security to its citizens alone, and presently would find itself at the mercy of the criminal and violent classes.

In a well-ordered community it does not suffice that after an *emeute* lasting for weeks—with direct losses of millions from acts of violence and rapine, and incidental losses of millions more from suspension of wage-earning, interruption of traffic, and interference with commerce, threatening starvation to whole communities and entailing destitution and misery upon thousands—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the national police should finally appear, and, taking stand on the ruins, amid the smoking desolation, command the disappearance of the rioters. It would be better if the ultimate hand of the law were raised at the first open act of defiance, and steadily and silently upheld in the face of impending riot, until the moral effect should have repressed the rising wave of violence, and given time for cooler counsels to prevail.

The United States in less than a century and a half has accomplished marvellous results, and won its way to a leading position among nations, displaying at all times an intelligent adaptation of means to ends that is the outgrowth of the fundamental common-sense of the people.

Nations are but individuals—infancy, manhood, old age, are equally the portion of both. The older nations of Europe are wearing themselves out faster than need be with their hostile and costly armaments, when the wasted revenues might be usefully employed in fostering the national vitality and bettering the condition of the people.

Young America in lusty growth and unexampled development already surpasses them, and has but just begun her race. To her hands is the future empire of the world to be committed. It is not too soon to be learning to handle the reins, and her first essay should be with her own people.

If the law in any of its practical effects shall involve injustice to or unnecessary hardship on any, let it be changed as shall seem best. The one principle that may not be changed is respect for and obedience to law so long as it is law.

This principle is the deepest teaching of the military life, and can best be preserved and expanded by the retention of an adequate military nucleus as a permanent and wisely regulated feature of the national life.

WILLIAM LUDLOW.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SHALL WE HAVE FREE SHIPS?

BY EDWARD KEMBLE, PRESIDENT OF THE BOSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

THE paper which appeared in the REVIEW for April last, under the title of "Our Navigation Laws," was remarkable for what it said and for what it left unsaid. The author is well known, and his words are entitled to consideration because he is well qualified to discuss the subject; but this should be done without prejudice, for it is a national subject.

The question is, Are the laws referred to, on the whole, advantageous to this country and conducive to its commercial growth at the present time? It can be considered properly, only in the light of experience, and particularly in connection with the present stage of the world's progress in commercial affairs.

The Act of December 31, 1792, forbids American registry to foreign-built ships. The object was undoubtedly to promote shipbuilding and its development in this country. There could have been no other object. This contributor says there was no need of such a law then, and quotes from a paper published in May, 1790, more than two and one-half years before the law was enacted, to sustain his statement. His view, apparently, is that it was enacted, with prophetic vision, for use sixty years later, when it would prevent the English builder from selling the modern steamship to an American buyer.

The art of shipbuilding, so far as can be ascertained, was not firmly established in this country in 1792, and what may be called its development had not yet begun. This law had a purpose then, and it was accomplished and justified by the impetus which the law gave to shipbuilding here, and the great development which followed later. It was soon found that such ships as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world wanted could be produced here cheaper and better than in any other country. Nothing like the American packet or the American clipper ship could be produced for the same money anywhere else. So this country took a place in the carrying trade of the world. Her ships were able to compete successfully with the ships of other nations, and gained the supremacy and maintained it until about 1850, when, very shortly, there appeared a new competitor—the iron ship of England. We could not compete with that country in this form of building, and have not been able to do it to this day. The iron ship could be produced for less money in England than in the United States or anywhere else, and it was this ship the world wanted. How, then, could we maintain our position, or preserve to ourselves any portion of the carrying trade of the world? Only by doing what other peoples were allowed to do, and did do—by buying the modern ship of England. This the old law of 1792 forbade. The Frenchman could do it, the German could do it, and people of other countries could do it, and they did it; and these countries have now a share of the carrying trade of the world. The American alone was forbidden to do it, and America has to-day no share of that trade.

When it became evident the ships needed could not be built here, it became evident, also, that our builders could not be injured by the buying of them abroad; and agitation began for the amendment of this old law, but to such an extent only as to admit ships *to be used in foreign trade*. This proposed modification of that law American builders have successfully opposed for thirty years! During all this period they have not only been unable to build these ships themselves, but they have refused to allow them to be built for their countrymen anywhere else. During this period, consequently, we have not only lost the foreign carrying trade we had previously gained by our superior wooden ships, but the opportunity also to secure for ourselves a share of the vast increase in that trade which has occurred during this time. For all these years their policy has been, by continuous appeals to national pride, and the national sentiment for the flag, to force government into the payment of subsidies in order to offset this obstacle of greater cost. So this law, while it secured to us protection and supremacy in the days of wooden ships, and has protected us advantageously in our coastwise trade, has cut

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

us off from any share in the foreign carrying trade in this day of iron ships.

This contributor says this law has no connection with "the doctrine of protection"; that it was not intended as a protective measure, and that "only superficial students and shallow reasoners" associate it with that system. It has been protection pure and simple—too solid protection in fact—whatever it was intended to be. It is an important protection to-day to our coastwise trade, and should not be changed, so far as this trade is concerned, because we can, of course, control our own ports; and by means of another act, which forbids foreign ships to trade between our ports, we control the traffic between them. Thus is "provided for the development and perpetuity of shipbuilding in the United States," a matter concerning which this contributor is, of course, much interested. Some of the ships in our coastwise trade are fine specimens of naval architecture, and we have some eight thousand miles of coast to supply. It matters very little whether the cost of a ship intended for that trade is greater in this country than in any other or not. She is free from the competition of a foreign-built ship, whatever her cost. So with our naval vessels. It matters little if they cost more when built here than they would if built in some other country. They are not going into business competition with any vessels, and we ought to build them in our own country, as we do. But we cannot control foreign ports, nor preserve the traffic between them, or between them and our own, or any portion of it, to ourselves by law. When we go into the foreign carrying trade we go into competition with the ships of all nations, and we can secure a portion of it only by offering the same terms and facilities others offer. In order to do this our ships must not cost more than the ships of other nations cost, nor be inferior to them. If we cannot buy them in this country, we must buy them in some other country, or give up that business.

The facts are that under this law our merchant marine grew and prospered for fifty or sixty years; while under the same law, that portion of it engaged in the foreign carrying trade has, during the past thirty years, disappeared. This contributor says:

"It would require a new school of logic to prove that it has worked both ways."

There is no logic so strong and so conclusive as the logic of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact. Are there no instances of laws, once beneficial, which have become, in the course of time, obstructive or injurious? We might prosper to-day under a law prohibiting the importation of corn; and starve under it to-morrow. Besides, it is pertinent to inquire not so much whether this law caused the prosperity of former years, as whether it has caused the ruin of late years.

We are informed that "as soon as the English found that they could build iron ships cheaper than we could, . . . they at once began to clamor for the repeal of our navigation laws"; . . . and that "then began a series of assaults on our navigation laws, always prompted from English sources."

General Grant, while President, in a special message to Congress, advocated a change in these laws and the admission of foreign built ships to American registry. Is it to be understood that this act of General Grant was one of the "assaults" referred to, and that it was prompted from "English sources"? The truth is, this talk of "English assaults" upon our navigation laws is not worthy of much consideration. The English had all the markets of the world open to them, save one. The carrying trade of the world demanded iron ships, and only English builders could furnish them. Pray what mattered it to them whether Americans could buy their ships or not? That was our lookout. The world's carrying trade was to be done by iron ships, and these ships would be bought to do it; if not by Americans, then by their own or other people. The English builders were sure to sell their ships; indeed they sold them faster than they could build them; and those who bought them were sure to get the carrying business; while those who did not buy them would have no share in it, as has been the case with Americans for thirty years. Furthermore, why should England desire to give the world's carrying trade into the hands of Americans, or any other people, merely for the sake of selling ships? Was it not for her interest to keep it in her own hands as much as possible? The carrying trade of the Atlantic Ocean alone amounts to one hundred and fifty millions of dollars, and more, per annum. Was it not for her good to own the ships which her builders alone could produce, and do this business? Certainly, and she owns most of the ships and does most of the business to-day.

The proposed modification of our navigation laws would be an injury to England, commercially. The special legislation in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this direction by which the "Paris" and the "New York" have been lately admitted to American registry, was an injury to England's interests, and was so considered abroad. Indeed, when this project was first mooted, discussion arose as to whether England would permit the transfer without objection.

Another curious statement is this: That this "repeal," as it is called, would be a great boon to England, because "in time of war . . . her ocean greyhounds . . . might remain under her flag, while all her slow freighters, tramps and obsolete passenger boats *would be transferred to our flag.*" Why would not the "ocean greyhounds"—if the Government did not take possession of them—be transferred also to our flag? Notwithstanding their speed, would they not be more secure under a neutral flag. Because of their speed would there be no war insurance rate to avoid? And why, pray, would the old tubs be transferred to the American flag only? Why not to other flags?

This contributor further says:

"It is observed that the present English raid on the navigation laws is the most determined yet made. This is because the development of shipbuilding capacity in Great Britain during the last decade has outstripped the demand for ships, and there is desperate need of a new market. France, Germany, Holland, Spain, Russia, and Italy, formerly large customers, . . . have almost entirely withdrawn their patronage from British yards."

These are all "free-ship" countries, and are now building many of their own ships—a happy result of the free-ship principle!

If there is no demand for ships, how will the "repeal" of these laws make a "new market"? Our coastwise trade (which it is not proposed to open to foreign-built ships) "is supplied for the rest of this century at least"—so this writer asserts; and if the foreign carrying trade is also supplied, how can a "new market" be found here? Americans certainly will not buy ships for which there is no use. The truth is, the greatest "raid" upon our navigation laws, and the most successful, up to this time, was the recent special legislation which admitted the ships "Paris" and "New York" to American registry. This writer not only did not object to that, but approved it, as most people did. The wedge has entered! Now let more be admitted, for the purposes of foreign trade; but without any other condition.

Furthermore, this contributor declares:

"I have brought these facts forward for the purpose of emphasizing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

my declaration, that the promotive influence behind every movement against our navigation laws is of British origin, and that whenever you put a pin through a free-ship bill you prick an 'Englishman.'"

Pray, who would have been pricked by a pin put through the free-ship bill which admitted the "Paris" and the "New York"? Certainly not an Englishman. There was no Englishman behind that bill; but who was behind it? Then he goes on further to say: "A vote for English free ships means a vote to reduce American wages;" and he declares:

"There is no alternative to reductions of wages except the total closing of American shipyards. This is what men mean when they talk of buying ships where they can buy them cheapest."

He has a great fear of the English ships, while he appreciates, and, according to his own declaration elsewhere, does not hesitate to use, English plans and patterns.

With this cry of "reduced wages" we are somewhat familiar. If we cannot build the ships here, how will the buying them abroad reduce our wages? The truth is, American shipyards, speaking generally, have not built ships for foreign trade for thirty years. These yards have been developed by building ships for our coastwise trade, which is very large, and by building government vessels. From the foreign carrying trade we are completely shut out, as this contributor himself declares. We can participate in it only by buying ships abroad, or by inducing government to pay, in one way or another, the extra cost of building them here; the latter is really what he advocates.

This is the gist of his argument. Although he scarcely mentions the word, it is a strong plea for subsidies. His argument summarized, means this:

1st. The law of 1792 never should be modified.

2d. We cannot build ships in competition with Great Britain.

3d. Therefore our Government should pay subsidies.

There is a serious question as to the wisdom, as well as to the propriety and justice, of attempting to establish a merchant marine, or anything else, by government aid. In this connection the term "postal subsidies," sometimes used, is misleading. It is really a misnomer. Its use came about from the fact that in the few cases where subsidies have been paid it has been usually stipulated that the mails should be carried without additional compensation. But compensation for postal service is really a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matter distinct and different from a subsidy. It is payment for a service rendered. It is payment for value received. This contributor says: "It would appear that compensation for service becomes 'subsidy' only when paid to an American shipowner." "Compensation" becomes subsidy only when it is paid for no return, or no value received, or when it exceeds in amount the market or proper value of the service rendered; whether it is paid for carrying the mails or anything else; or to shipowners or shipbuilders, or to railroads or to any one else.

The word "subsidy" means "aid in money;" "to hold up by means of money," and has very much the same signification as the word "bounty," which means "a premium;" "money given to promote any object." It was used in this sense in Great Britain in connection with government aid to two or three steamship lines many years ago. Of course postal service should be paid for like any other service, and there is no reason why money so paid should be called a "subsidy"; and it is not so called. There is no difference of opinion as to the propriety of paying a proper compensation for postal service, or for the right to take ships in time of war, or for any other service or privilege. A difference of opinion exists as to the payment of money in aid of shipping; the payment of a gratuity—a benefaction. Such a thing can be justified only by the gravest reasons, and when it is clearly for the benefit of the whole people. When the British Government found it necessary to do this years ago, it was to establish and maintain regular communication with its outlying provinces. This could then be secured in no other way. Does any one really suppose England would pay a subsidy for sentiment,—in order to see her flag waving in foreign seas,—or even to establish commercial business,—or for the encouragement of navagation? Not at all! Her provinces had an undoubted right to demand reliable communication with the home-country. Commercial business was not then sufficient to sustain it, and it could be furnished only by the aid of government. This aid was called a subsidy. It had nothing whatever to do with the cost of ships, or the expense of sailing them. It was paid only in rare cases, and always withdrawn as soon as the necessary communication could be maintained without it. The truth is that only in exceptional cases have subsidies ever been paid. Some of the best lines of ships never received a dollar of subsidy. The finest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lines of steamships, and probably the most prosperous, ply between the United States and Europe. There are some twenty-five or thirty of these lines, most of them under the English flag, and, with one exception, they receive no subsidy from any government, and only two of them ever did receive such aid.

Who has heard in years of the British Government subsidizing a line of ships? It is not only a grossly unjust, but whenever resorted to it has been found an unsatisfactory, system. This country has tried it, years ago, and notwithstanding the unpleasant experience then acquired it has recently embarked again in the experiment. The scandal attending the subsidy paid to the Collins line of American steamships is a matter of history; and that caused by the subsidy which was paid to the Pacific Mail Company cannot have passed entirely from memory. The amount paid the latter company was found upon investigation by Congress to have been nearly all expended in efforts to secure a greater one, and the government rightly withdrew the benefaction. The payment of subsidies will not accomplish what all desire so much to see, simply because such a system is artificial; and nothing artificial can contend with the real and succeed. It is quite apparent that the commercial conditions and requirements which surround the United States, in connection with this question, are very different from those of Great Britain; so utterly dissimilar that even if that country paid subsidies, it could not be argued with any force that the United States should pay them for the same reasons. But notwithstanding statements to the contrary—and gross misstatements have been made—Great Britain has never paid subsidies in any general way. She owns to-day $\frac{7}{12}$ths of the world's shipping, and more than 70 per cent. of the steam tonnage; and only about $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of it receives anything from the government, or ever did receive anything, either for carrying the mails or in any other way!

In this connection there is to be found an important item of evidence that the payment of subsidies will not necessarily establish foreign trade. The English government once paid the Cunard Company a subsidy of £180,000 per annum. This was done to secure regular sailings between Liverpool and Halifax, which were maintained for some years. If trade can be built up in this way why are not Cunard steamers running between these two ports to-day? As soon as the Cunard Company was released

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from its obligation to sail to Halifax, and was free, it began to make its sailings to Boston and to New York. This line has received no subsidy for many years. It makes bids in competition with other lines for carrying the mails, and secures its mail contracts with the home government in this way.

Neither will the payment of subsidies necessarily increase or establish a merchant marine; indeed such payments are likely to operate adversely. Certainly this will be so unless every ship and every line is subsidized, for an unsubsidized line cannot, it is manifest, compete with a subsidized line; and if every line which may be formed is alike subsidized, and all are running at government expense, where is the incentive to establish a self-sustaining business? History shows the subsidy system to have been a failure. The French Government continued it for a long period, and it was found that, instead of building up a self-sustaining carrying trade in French vessels, the French tonnage actually decreased, and a demand was made for the adoption of the German policy of free ships and free materials. Italy, it is said, under the subsidy system lost much of her shipping. It is a notable fact that the merchant marine of commercial countries whose citizens are permitted to buy ships where they may choose to do so has generally increased rapidly without any subsidy system.

The argument in favor of subsidies in this country is full of misrepresentation. It has been put before the country in a very misleading way, to say the least. A United States Senator, not so very long ago, when a bill was before Congress providing for the payment, not only of subsidies to steam vessels but for bounties to sailing vessels, said, in a speech:

> **"One branch of commerce, indeed, the foreign carrying trade, languishes for want of the encouragement to our shipping which every other commercial nation gives to its own."**

If by "encouragement" were meant a complete change in our navigation laws, the statement might have been true. But he was arguing in favor of the bill above referred to,—not for free ships,—and afterwards voted for it. He conveyed by this language the idea that subidies and bounties were the "encouragement which every other commercial nation" gave to its foreign carrying trade—an erronous idea, and many, no doubt, have been misled by the statement.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The truth is that of some twenty or twenty-five successful steam lines now plying between the United States and Europe, and some twenty-five more plying between the United States and foreign ports outside of Europe, only one receives a subsidy, and only two, or at most three, of them ever did receive such aid!

It appears, therefore, that the carrying trade of the world has not been built up by subsidies. Least of all has the carrying trade of England been established in that way. England abolished her navigation laws in 1840, when it was cheaper for her to buy than to build ships, and prosperity upon the sea has attended her ever since that day. So with other nations. Free ships, and free materials for ships, have brought to them a share of the world's carrying trade. If the United States is to secure a share, it would seem to be necessary to place her merchants on an equality with foreign merchants, and American enterprise will do the rest. Make our navigation laws—so far as they relate to foreign trade only—like the navigation laws of other nations. Give the American the same opportunity the foreigner has. Let him buy his ships wherever he may choose to buy them. This is the key to the whole matter. This Government has acknowledged it by admitting the "Paris" and the "New York" to registry.

We hear a good deal about the ardent desire some men have to see the American flag waving over foreign seas. If these men are honest, why do they oppose that change in our laws which will permit it? American capital already owns some foreign built ships; but even though they be sailing out of our own ports they may not carry the flag—the "Paris" and the "New York" alone excepted.

The reasons for the proposed modification in our navigation laws may be summed up as follows: 1st. It would permit the American flag to secure a portion of the carrying trade of the world. 2d. It would afford the opportunity, long looked for, to re-establish the American merchant marine. 3d. It would contribute to the commercial prosperity and power of the United States, and afford increased employment for her people.

These are all American reasons. There are no English reasons.

EDWARD KEMBLE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW DEATH DUTIES IN ENGLAND.

BY THE EARL OF WINCHILSEA AND NOTTINGHAM.

THE condition of the landed interest in Great Britain has long been one of grave and increasing anxiety. This is a fact proclaimed by all whose fortunes are embarked in real estate, and not denied even by those who are most eager to add to its burdens and to curtail its few remaining privileges. But the full extent of the agrarian revolution which has taken place in our midst during the last twenty years is in reality little understood. Hence we gladly embrace the opportunity afforded to us by the new death duties, not only to point out the disastrous effect they may be expected to have upon an industry already overburdened with taxation, but to present our readers with an outline of the whole agricultural situation in view of which they were imposed. Indeed it is impossible correctly to estimate the one unless we first succeed in grasping the other.

To Americans at least, the fate of the great historical homes of England can never be a matter of indifference. At a time when Middlesborough could not boast of a single furnace, and the Warwickshire peasant still guided his plough over the scene of the future municipal triumphs of Mr. Chamberlain, our old baronial halls presented much the same appearance that they do to-day, and were wont to send forth the common ancestors of Americans and Englishmen to win, on many a hard-fought field, triumphs which have become the common heritage of the race. When an American pays a visit to the Old Country, it is not to our great centres of trade and population that he turns his steps most naturally. He finds few attractions in cities like Manchester or Birmingham. He has neither part nor lot in their mushroom growth. Wonderful as it is, its record is easily beaten by New York and Chicago. About such places he will be asked little on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his return home, but he will assuredly lose caste if he cannot describe, with the accuracy of an eyewitness, the birthplace of the Bard of Avon and the dungeons of Berkeley, the treasures of Hatfield House, and the view from the terrace at Belvoir.

Land in England may be said to have touched the zenith of its prosperity in 1874. At that time foreign competition, which has since attained to such extraordinary dimensions, was still comparatively in its infancy, and the British farmer still retained his command of the home market. The general trade of the country had increased "by leaps and bounds," and had created for his produce a steady demand which a series of bountiful harvests enabled him to supply. Rents were high, but they were cheerfully and punctually paid, nor were they felt to constitute any excessive burden. Land itself changed hands at enormous prices, and, as it was thought to be the one class of property which "could not run away," it was selected as the safest form of investment, by an infinite variety of persons, from the largest corporations in the realm down to the trustees of the village charity, all eager either to purchase outright or to advance their money to the owner on mortgage. It was no uncommon thing to see clerks pressing the check-books of their respective banks into the hand of a tenant farmer in the open market, with a request that he would allow their firm to open an account for him, and a hint that he might overdraw it by as many hundreds as he chose. Thus the happy possessor of land found himself placed between two competitors for his favor—the willing mortgagee, anxious to advance him whatever he required at four per cent., and his own tenant, equally desirous to pay him five per cent. upon any improvements he might execute on the farm.

Yet to those who could read them aright, signs were not wanting that the tide of prosperity was about to turn. A period of inflation in trade is usually followed by a wave of depression of proportionate depth and duration. The stimulus given to production had resulted in an immense increase of the world's supplies which soon made itself felt in the shape of a fall in prices, hastened and aggravated by the appreciation of gold, which followed the closing of European mints to the free coinage of silver in 1873. The great activity in the shipbuilding trade, which had arisen from the necessity of keeping pace with an ever-expanding commerce, now threw upon the hands of their owners

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a number of new vessels for which they were unable to obtain freights, the moment the volume of trade became stationary, and reduced them to the alternative of either paying off their crews or continuing to carry cargoes at almost nominal rates. An immense impetus was thus given to the importation of meat, corn, and every species of foreign produce into Great Britain, at the precise moment when science, by the invention of freezing and other processes designed to counteract the bad effects which a long voyage had hitherto produced, had placed shippers in a position to avail themselves of the access thus afforded them to the greatest free market in the world.

The result to the landed interest in England was immediate and disastrous. The farmer, rudely deposed from his supremacy in the home market, found himself obliged to compete with every country which, by possessing a better climate, a fresher soil, or a cheaper supply of labor than his own, was able to undersell him. A succession of wet seasons and disastrous harvests, amongst which the year 1879 will long be remembered as having attained a bad preëminence, served to complete his misfortunes. Nor was this all. In England alone, amongst civilized countries, so far as we are aware, land and houses, while they pay their full share of imperial charges, are called upon to defray the whole cost of local taxation, including such serious items as the maintenance of roads, the relief of the poor, public elementary education, police, drainage, and water supply, the expenses of which are met by what is termed a "rate," levied on land and house property exclusively, personal property being entirely exempted. On this subject we shall have something further to say when we come to consider the claim put forward on behalf of the new death duties to have established equality between the taxation of land and that of other property. Suffice it to say here, that a burden which, however unjust, had been cheerfully borne so long as the produce of land continued, owing to protective duties or to natural causes, to be remunerative, was felt by the farmer to be an intolerable hardship when the profits of his business began to disappear, the more so because the simultaneous transfer of the power to lay rates from his own class to representative boards elected by persons the majority of whom were often not ratepayers at all, had a constant tendency to increase expenditure at the very moment when his ability to meet it was diminishing.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Meanwhile the difficulties of the landlord became scarcely less acute than those of his tenant. He had probably borrowed largely on the security of his estate, in order to effect the improvements his tenantry desired, improvements on which, as we have seen, they had offered in perfect good faith to pay a fair percentage. The percentage he had now to remit, and with it a large slice of the original rent, varying from 20 to 30, 40, and even 50 per cent., or to farm the land himself. But he could make no similar claim upon his mortgagee. Whether he received his rents or not, the interest must be paid to the day or the property itself be forfeited. The new buildings, it is true, remained on the land, and the new drains still existed beneath it, but they were of little value except as evidence of the good intentions of the owner in constructing them, now that the stock which should have filled the one, and the crops which were to have been improved by the other, had become alike unprofitable. Furthermore, if his predecessor, following a practice all but universal upon English estates, had charged the property with a jointure in favor of his widow (and we know cases in which three or more of such jointures are running at the same time), no matter how much the rents might have been reduced, he would have to pay the charges so created in full. Thus it frequently happened that the rental had to be divided, to the last shilling, between the annuitants and the mortgagee, while the owner was left to bear the whole brunt of the care and management of the estate, himself the only living being upon it who derived no benefit whatever from the income it yielded. On innumerable estates at the present moment the rental does not represent bare interest on the money actually laid out by the landlord upon his property; in other words, the land has returned to its "prairie value," and is yielding no rent at all. Under these circumstances it is little to be wondered at that half the country houses in England have been closed or have passed into other hands, and that, even where the squire and his family retain possession of the old Hall, they have shrunk into a corner of it, so that they can scarcely be said to inhabit so much as to haunt, like the ghosts of their departed selves, the scenes of their former hospitality.

It might well be thought that the innocent victims of a catastrophe which, as we have said, and as our readers must have already perceived, has amounted to nothing less than an agrarian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolution would command universal sympathy, and would at least receive the tenderest consideration at the hands of the legislature. Indeed, the landed interest as a whole has better and more abiding claims to both than any which can be founded upon its misfortunes alone. Agriculture, whether we consider the capital invested in it or the number of persons to whom it gives employment, is still the most important industry in Great Britain; in Ireland it far outweighs all others combined. It is the rural districts alone which furnish to the army and navy recruits who are able, from their superior health and physique, to withstand the hardships and the ever-varying climatic conditions of an imperial service. It is the combined enterprise of English landlords and their tenants which alone saves the country from being placed wholly at the mercy of foreign, and possibly hostile, nations for its daily supply of food in time of war. The squire himself, while he is no sleeping partner in the business of producing food from the soil, is usually the mainspring of such activity as is to be met with in rural districts, and the pivot on which country life revolves. Not only does he gratuitously render to the state, as a magistrate, services which in other countries are often highly paid, but he is expected to act as a kind of "universal provider,"—the promoter of every local undertaking for the good of his neighbors. Not a cricket club can be started, not a friendly society inaugurated, not a flower show held within a dozen miles of his park without an appeal to the squire's purse, which is sure to be successful. Nay, it is seldom that a laborer's cow or a carrier's horse is suffered to pay the debt of nature without his being invited to put his hand in his pocket to make good in part the loss which has fallen upon his poorer neighbor. Has a laborer been turned off because he is too old to do a full day's work on the neighboring farm? The squire's bailiff will have orders to employ him. Is a village dame in want of fuel? She may gather it under his oaks; and if her daughter is recovering from an illness she will have an order for a daily supply of fresh milk from the dairy and soup from the kitchen, until she is convalescent, with a bottle of port wine into the bargain from the squire's own cellar to bring back the faded roses to her cheeks.

But unfortunately the landed interest, in the hour of its utmost need, found itself the object of a deep and abiding resentment to more than one powerful section of the community, a re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentment not the less to be dreaded because the causes which provoked it had long ago ceased to exist. This animosity had, in fact, become almost an article of faith with the extreme section of one of the great political parties, and part of its stock in trade. It is a well-established maxim of English law, interpreted, of course, in a constitutional and not in a literal sense, that the king can do no wrong; but the school of politicians to which we refer had adopted, without any qualification whatever, the maxim that a landlord can do no right. Such belated fanaticism would be incredible were this a solitary instance of it. But the pathway of these well-meaning persons is strewn with the innocent victims of a reforming zeal which usually attains its maximum about thirty years after the abuse which gave rise to it has ceased to exist. They are at this moment engaged in a crusade against the national church, based very largely upon the supposed shortcomings of the clergy. But the last specimen of the port-drinking, fox-hunting parson, who could have provoked, and who, indeed, deserved their anathemas, has long ago eluded their pursuit by dying of old age, or, as he would probably have himself expressed it, by "going to ground," and the blow, if it succeeds, will fall on his successor, usually a courteous Christian gentleman, who, if he has a country rectory, is often the only man of culture and refinement in his parish, or, if his lot is cast in a great city, is striving to cope with the myriad wants of an ever-increasing population with a devotion which has not been exceeded since the apostolic age, and on a pittance which St. Paul himself would have been driven to eke out by tentmaking. As with the church, so with the land. To the politician of the Manchester school, brought up at the feet of Bright and Cobden, the political successor of the men who repealed the Corn Laws, the landowner still appears, not as he is now, but as he was then; not as the chief partner in an industry which has for its object the growth of food for the people, but as the principal obstacle to the introduction of cheap bread. Accordingly he sets him down once for all as an enemy of the people, turns a deaf ear to his plea for sympathy or at least for bare justice, sees in every suggestion for the relief of British agriculture protection in disguise, rejoices in his approaching downfall, and resolves by every means in his power to accelerate it.

In this amiable intention he would probably have been frustrated had he not received timely assistance at the critical moment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from a new and unexpected quarter. The agricultural laborer, though his condition had much improved, had not been admitted by the farmer to any very generous share of the prosperity which had visited the farm in the period preceding 1874, and he felt, perhaps even more keenly, that with rare exceptions he was still excluded from the counsels of his employer, and treated, not as a partner, but a mere machine in the great business of agriculture. He was now enfranchised, his numbers gave him a preponderating vote in the county constituencies, and his master discovered too late that confidence is a plant of slow and gradual growth, and is not to be conjured into existence on the eve of a contested election. It was in vain he argued with his men that their interests and his own were identical, and pleaded with perfect truth his inability to pay high wages out of decreasing profits; they remembered that the argument had availed them little when times were good and they had asked for increased pay. They desired, not unnaturally, to make use of their new-born powers to improve their own position, and they were shrewd enough to see that this newly awakened zeal for their welfare on the part of their employer was not entirely disinterested. The agitator saw and seized his opportunity. As if by magic he made his appearance in every rural district in England, denounced all employers as tyrants, and all rent as sheer robbery, whispered that the ballot-box revealed no secrets, and promised that every laborer who would pluck up courage enough to vote against his employer's nominee at the polls should find himself the immediate possessor of "three acres and a cow."

In districts where a good feeling prevailed between employers and employed this pernicious nonsense was received with the contempt it deserved, and the author of it was fortunate if he escaped a ducking, but wherever their relations were strained it was completely successful. In a host of counties the squire, who for years perhaps had represented the agricultural interest with credit and even distinction, suddenly found himself defeated at the polls by a stranger who could not tell oats from barley, nay, who gloried in his absolute ignorance of everything which affected the great business by which his constituents earned their living. Even where the old member retained his seat, he was greatly hampered in his efforts to avert the catastrophe he foresaw, by the necessity he was under of tickling the political palate of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new voters, many of whom, if they disbelieved in their hearts the promises of plunder which had been held out to them by his opponent, were yet not indisposed to leave their employers for a time in the lurch. It is true that at the moment when the budget was introduced a reaction had already set in in the direction of common-sense, and agriculturists were begining to realize the suicidal folly of dividing their forces into hostile camps instead of uniting them for self-defence. The National Agricultural Union had been founded, and its programme accepted by 150 members of the House of Commons, but although the nucleus of a powerful agricultural party in Parliament had thus been formed, the movement was still in its infancy. Thus it came about that British agriculture, at the very crisis of its fate, presented the deplorable spectacle of a house divided against itself, or rather of some beleaguered city whose enemies are combining their forces for a desperate assault, at the very moment when her citizens are deprived by internal dissensions of the power to offer an effective resistance.

We must now turn our attention to the death duties; but our readers will, we hope, pardon a digression which was necessary in order that they should understand what would otherwise be inexplicable—how it happened that when our greatest national industry lay bleeding to death the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who ought surely to have been the first to staunch its wounds, should have brought forward a budget which, if not introduced, was openly supported, on the ground that the duties it imposed would give the *coup-de-grace* to the landed interest.

Sir William Harcourt introduced his proposals in a speech of studied moderation, but it was impossible to disguise the gravity of the changes they involved. It was not that there was anything new in the imposition of death duties, even upon real property. They already existed in the form of probate duty and legacy duty, both chargeable on personal property alone; succession duty, which fell almost exclusively on realty, and estate duty, an additional charge of one per cent. upon all property of both kinds of the value of £10,000 and upwards. We may explain, in passing, that probate duty is paid out of the estate itself before it can be administered, and legacy or succession duty, as the case may be, by each inheritor upon the value of his separate share, the rate of duty varying in both cases according to the relation-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ship of the heir to the predecessor, and, in the case of succession duty, being calculated upon the capitalized value of his life interest, after deducting encumbrances, and payable by eight half-yearly instalments.

The proceeds of the existing duties were stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to be :—from realty, £1,150,000 ; from personalty, £8,910,000 ; and he estimated that these figures would be augmented, by the new duties he was about to impose, to £2,500,000 and £11,000,000 respectively. Thus while the duties on personal property were only to be raised 24 per cent., those which fell on realty, or, in other words, on land and houses, were to be increased to the enormous extent of no less than 117 per cent. Nor was this all. The whole basis on which land had hitherto been assessed to the death duties was to be altered, and a new principle introduced. Not only did the new duty for the first time affirm the principle of graduated taxation, (since it ranged in an ascending scale, from one per cent. on property not exceeding £500, up to eight per cent. on £1,000,000 and upwards ;) but henceforward both the new estate duty and the old succession duty, which still remained in force, were to be calculated, not on the life interest of the successor, but on the principal value of the property; and this was defined to be (subject to certain encumbrances) "the price which, in the opinion of the commissioners, such property would fetch if sold in the open market at the time of the death of the deceased." The successor was even deprived of the privilege of time to pay in. He might indeed still elect to pay by instalments, but to each instalment would be added interest upon the whole of the unpaid balance of the duty, a balance which, in the event of his own death taking place before it was paid off, was now for the first time to become a liability upon his heir.

When the Chancellor of the Exchequer sat down, it was felt that the real case for the new death duties rested upon two propositions, both of which were either expressly stated or implied in his speech. These were: (1) That in the matter of taxation realty was unduly favored as compared with personalty under the existing system, and that the new duties would establish an equality between them ; and, (2) that the two kinds of property were not, in their nature, so different as to make it easy for the one to pay the proposed new tax, but difficult, if not impossible,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the other, without seriously crippling the owner or even forcing him to sell the *corpus* of the estate. This last, it was felt on all hands, was a crucial test of the *bona fides* of the government, since it is evident that when, if ever, public policy requires that great estates in England shall be broken up, good faith will equally demand that the owners shall be expropriated by direct legislation, on fair terms, and not ruined under the pretence of taxation.

We will take these propositions in the order in which we have stated them. If by equality of taxation were meant the payment of equal death duties, we should at once admit that in this respect real property has always been favored by successive chancellors of the Exchequer, partly for reasons which we hope to make clear later on, but chiefly on the very sufficient ground that it pays enormously more than its fair share of taxation in other ways. But in order to establish Sir William Harcourt's case, it must be proved that, taking into account the whole taxation of the country, and not merely one branch of it, real property pays less than personal property in proportion to the income which it yields. Nor is it possible to omit from such a calculation taxation raised for local purposes, a branch of the public revenue quite as indispensable as any other, embracing, as we have have already seen, some of the most important headings of national expenditure, and amounting to close on £30,000,000 a year. We will give our readers the precise figures, and they will then be in a position to judge for themselves. Leaving out of account indirect taxation and income tax, the incidence of which we may admit is fairly enough distributed between real and personal property, the fiscal burdens of the country, and the sums they severally bring in, were, according to the latest available official returns—

1892-3	Death duties	£10,060,000	
	Land tax	1,901,716	
	Inhabited-house duty	1,411,510	
	Local taxation licenses	3,098,769	£45,227,976
	Part of beer and spirit duties devoted to local purposes	927,745	
1890-1	Local rates (England and Wales)	27,828,236	

to which realty and personalty respectively contributed—

Realty	Part of death duties	£1,150,000		
	Land tax (the whole)	1,901,716	£32,291,462	
	Inhabited-house duty (the whole)	1,411,510		
	Local rates (the whole)	27,828,236		£45,227,976
Personalty	Part of death duties	8,910,000		
	Local taxation licenses	3,098,769	£12,936,514	
	Beer and spirit duties	927,745		

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now, it must not be forgotten that of the £1,000,000,000 a year which is estimated to be the income of the country, only about £160,000,000, or less than one-sixth of the whole, arises from land and houses, the remaining five-sixths, or no less than £840,000,000, being derived from personalty. It is evident, therefore, that in order to establish equality of taxation, the proportion paid by each of the two kinds of property ought to correspond with these figures: realty ought to pay one-sixth and personalty five-sixths of the whole. If we apply this test to the sums actually paid by each, it will become clear that, of the £45,000,000 odd, realty ought to pay about seven and a half millions instead of thirty-two, and personalty thirty-seven and a half millions instead of thirteen; in other words, realty is paying four times as much and personalty three times as little as it ought. Thus the whole edifice which Sir William Harcourt has reared with so much care, crumbles to pieces the moment the test which he has himself invited is applied to it. If he had been really in search of equality he would have found that after transferring the succession duty, the land tax, the inhabited-house duty, and half the local rates from realty to personalty, there still remained a substantial balance to be redressed. The truth is that the present anomaly is so scandalous that we have never heard it defended, except by one argument which was invented by the present Secretary of State for India when he was President of the Local Government Board. Mr. Fowler has discovered that the grievances of land in the matter of taxation have been borne for so many years that they have now become "hereditary" and have lost their claim to be redressed. This astounding theory of heredity, if it were valid at all, would have made every reform to which the Liberal party has set its hand for the last 200 years, including the abolition of slavery, impossible; but the climax of absurdity is reached when we are assured, in the same breath, that the grievances which landowners suffer must be perpetuated because, having become hereditary, they cannot be removed, but that the House in which they legislate must be abolished because, being a hereditary chamber, its continuance cannot be defended.

But it is not until we pass to the second of our two propositions, and inquire into the essential differences between the two kinds of property charged, from the point of view of their ability

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to pay the tax, that the full significance of the new duties as they will affect real property can be understood. We will endeavor to make clear what these differences are by means of an illustration. A and B are two clerks in the Foreign Office, each in receipt of a salary of £500 a year. One morning A receives a letter informing him that a perfect stranger whom he once saved from drowning has left him a legacy of a little over £100,000. By the same post B learns that a friend of his father's has left him a landed property in Bedfordshire, the "principal value" of which, he eventually satisfies the commissioners, is of equal amount. In a few weeks' time the executors pay to the inland revenue £6,000, and hand over the balance, £94,000, to A in cash or securities, and it then becomes his own absolutely, subject only to the payment of legacy duty. He is thus put in possession at once of a clear addition to his income of, say, £3,000 a year. His newly acquired wealth creates no fresh claims upon his purse or his time; he may increase his establishment just as much or as little as he pleases; he need not even give up his official income and position. But B's difficulties begin precisely where A's end. The property which has been left to him was worth, in 1874, £400,000, but is now, owing to agricultural depression, valued at about £300,000. The late owner borrowed at different times £200,000 on the security of the estate, on which interest at four per cent. has still to be paid. There is a large house on the property, with stables and gardens to correspond, a great number of old servants and dependants about the place, commended to the special favor of his heir by the late proprietor in his will, and 1,500 acres of poor clay land in hand. During the last few years of his life "master was too old to attend to much business," so the farmhouses, buildings, and cottages all over the estate are very much out of repair—many of the tenants are in arrear with their rents, owing to hard times, and have given notice to leave, but are now holding on for a time in the hope that the new landlord will spend money freely on the estate, and carry out a quantity of draining and other improvements which they forbore to press upon the old squire in his declining years. Being a man of action, B's resolve is soon taken. He sees that such a state of affairs cannot be grappled with except on the spot, much less during the spare hours of an official life in London, and he writes to his chief to give up his berth at the Foreign

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Office. As he does so he wonders if he will ever again have a safe £500 a year which he can call his own. Then he sends for the agent and the bailiff, goes carefully into the whole position, finds that an expenditure of £10,000 will put the property into fair order, and returns to London to raise the money, in the only way open to him—on second mortgage. The family lawyer, on whom he calls, admits that this may possibly be done, though investors are naturally shy of second mortgages on land, but "how," he asks, "about the death duties, which will amount," he calculates, "to some £11,000"? How, indeed! Poor B; he looks blank enough; for how is he to raise that sum in addition to the other? If he drops his scheme of estate improvements how is he to keep his tenants? and if they leave, how can he find capital to carry on their farms? "Can he not sell a part of the property?" he asks. "No, there are no detached portions, and to cut up the property would destroy the amenity, and be certain to alarm the existing mortgagees; there is indeed one part of the estate, close to the town of C, which will eventually become building land, and has a prospective value on that account which he fears must be taken into account for death duty, but it has no present value." "Can he let the place?" "Well, hardly; it is far from a station, the neighborhood is a bad one, and a new tenant would scarcely be satisfied with the drains. The old squire was no believer in such things until his only daughter died in the house last year of diphtheria, when Messrs. Sniffem and Tester were called in, but their estimate, some £1,500, was not carried out, owing to the squire's own death." What is to be done? Two alternatives, and only two, present themselves. B may borrow the money for the improvements, return to his desk, discharge every gardener, keeper, stableman, and laborer whose services can possibly be dispensed with, and shut up the place for four years, during which he will have to devote the whole income to paying the duty by instalments, a process which, by the bye, will increase them by some £750; or he may sell the whole estate. Let us suppose that he adopts the latter alternative. The property is put up. There has been another bad harvest, and land is a drug in the market. The mortgagees bid up the value of their mortgage, and at last £215,000 is bid. The property is knocked down. The mortgagees take £200,000; the government claims

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

£11,000; the auctioneer's commission amounts to £2,150; while the testator's debts and the small legacies which he had directed to be paid out of his estate, absorb the remainder. B returns to London a ruined man, only to find that his clerkship has been filled up, and that A is still in the enjoyment of his official income and a clear £3,000 a year in addition to it from his legacy. The moral is that land is not money, and that if the Government obliges the owner to convert it into money when it is practically unsalable, there is no limit to the loss which may be inflicted upon him by a forced sale in a falling market.

But we must hasten to a conclusion. If it be objected that B's case is not a typical one, we answer that the exact circumstances under which B inherited may be paralleled on hundreds of estates throughout the country, and that, in common with every family lawyer, we know of cases infinitely more complicated and distressing still. If we are told that the duties can be covered by insurance, we reply that it argues little knowledge of human nature to suppose that many men will mulct themselves of large sums annually in order to relieve their heirs from a legal obligation, and that it must not be forgotten that the new duties are cumulative, so that, in the event of three or four deaths taking place in rapid succession, the last successor will have to pay the combined duties of all his immediate predecessors in addition to his own. That the sequel may occasionally be less disastrous than we have pictured it in B's case we readily admit. We sincerely hope so. It is no part of our business to prove that a catastrophe is in all cases inevitable; rather is it the duty of the authors of a measure such as this to show that it is not a probable, or even a possible, result of their legislation. They have brought forward their new tax under the pressure of no financial necessity, in the sacred name of equality, and it is proved to aggravate an inequality already sufficiently scandalous; they have imposed it in such a way as deliberately to ignore essential differences between the two kinds of property which it professes to affect equally, and at a moment when the class of property which it will hit the hardest is passing through a prolonged crisis of unexampled severity. It has been our task to point out these plain facts; it must be theirs to reconcile them with the hitherto unbroken traditions of British statesmanship.

WINCHILSEA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HISTORIC POLITICAL UPHEAVALS.

BY EX-SPEAKER REED.

WHEN our forefathers planned the system of government which is contained in the Constitution of the United States they not only had to provide such arrangements as respected the powers and customs which already existed, but they had to reckon also with a deep-seated distrust of the people which had come down from ancient times. Government by the people, pure and simple, for three million human beings was an experiment which might lead to such disorders as would welcome back monarchical forms and the control of the few. Hence almost every one was ready to so shape the action required to bind the States together through concessions to the demands of each that the people should be restrained from immediate control. The result has been that our government, while it was more responsive when constituted to the popular changes, has become less immediately so than the government of Great Britain, which has no written constitution, but which has become by repeated modifications more amenable in some respects to popular wishes because it is a government, in form as well as in substance, of to-day. Whether this very fact that popular will cannot find vent in immediate action does not produce some of the sudden and violent changes which it was intended to guard against may well be a question.

Where no immediate result is to follow, when the election is not to become immediately effective, where it is as it were in the nature of a warning, the pendulum is sometimes swung to a higher point than it will reach on the next return, and shakes up the clock besides.

This generation in which we live has certainly witnessed some remarkably rapid changes from one side to the other which de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

serve careful consideration. In the main, however, they probably represent the same method of motion which the world seems to require for its onward progress towards a higher civilization. If we were under the control of a philosopher, these sudden changes, these frequent swingings from side to side, would seem irrational and wasteful both of onward movement and of prosperity. Undoubtedly we could imagine a world which would proceed upon a continuous up-grade, so many inches to the mile, so many miles to the year, and all without jostle or push, comfortable and serene from dawn to dark. Obviously, however, that is pure imagination—a day-dream of a world which has never existed, of a people which never lived. All history shows that after any great advance the refluent wave has very often obliterated the very signs which marked the starting-point, and yet in the long run the tide has never ceased advancing. Undoubtedly this arises from the very constitution of human nature itself. Life would be very dreary without the element of the unknown, the effects of which we call luck. Men do not want certainties, and are always looking out for the unexpected which they always hope will be better than the known.

History is replete with examples of these strange revulsions, and is a great warning to us not to consider anything as a victory until time has tried it—time which tries all things. When the French Revolution burst through all the safeguards which bound up with church and state the enslavement of the people, a spectator might well have thought that for that nation at least kings and monarchs of all species had passed forever away. So, too, when twenty years afterwards all Europe aroused itself, to put down not the French Republic, for that had already disappeared, but the ideas of the Revolution, its learning and its teachings, and placed over the crushed and exhausted French people the dynasty of other days, every one was sure that the old days had come again in permanence and peace. But history has shown that the old days had passed away, never to return. So when Cromwell was at the zenith of his fame, and England had killed its king and chased his successor out of the kingdom; when John Milton was foreign secretary, and the name of England was respected all over the world, as it had never been since the days of Elizabeth and the defeat of the Spanish Armada,—he would have been a bold man who had prophesied the reign of Charles

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Second, a king who had every power which had been the subject of battle with his dead father, a monarch whose life illustrated every vice and shame which the Puritan despised, and who was at once the pensioner of France and the betrayer of his country. Yet Charles the Second has his place in English history, and his partisans in their turn thought that the free thoughts and high aspirations of the Puritan leaders were never to be anything else but the jest of soulless courtiers and ladies whom the king delighted to honor.

But the principles of liberty had never died, and after three decades of misrule the Puritan uprising ripened into the practices of the Free England, which followed the revolution of 1688. The Free England, of 1688, however, was not the England of Cromwell, or of the long Parliament, but England such as the whole people made it, after a long education by adversity.

Perhaps it is not worth while to try to account fully for these changes and revulsions, and yet it may not be out of place to mention what are probably some of the causes of them. Ultimately, the people govern. There are ostentatious actors here and there, who stride the stage with panoply or with clanging arms, who seem to do many things, but in the end the popular feeling has its way. William the Norman and his barons could conquer England, and be its conspicuous figures in history. They could also have their influence over its institutions and habits, but in the end the English people absorbed the Normans, and are the English people still. Minorities frequently govern, because a man adds to his power by his zeal. It might be very doubtful whether Cromwell and the people of his way of thinking were in the majority when they were in power; but what they lacked in numbers they made up in courage, zeal, and conduct. One man who knows what he wants to do may be worth a dozen for an event or for a time, but in the final result we count nearer equality than we are willing to say. For the long run it is the intelligence of all which conquers, and not the courage of the few. England, with some of its people vehement for liberty, and the great majority careless, could not become a free people until the leaven had leavened the whole. It took not only the genius of Cromwell, but also the thirty years of Charles the Second, to permeate the people with the desire for liberty.

Good laws and good administration are the achievements of a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

good people. A temporary conquest by a minority, even if the laws are abstractly good, is not, and never has been, sufficient. Either the laws will be imperfectly administered, or, if rigidly administered, will be overturned. An ideal law is one which would represent the average sentiment of the people, neither the best nor the worst. Such laws are seldom passed, perhaps, but they ought always to be striven for, and whoever desires to serve his country should seek the happy mean. No one doubts, however, that it is better to aim high than to aim low: for the struggle for something above the public sentiment is an education of the sentiment itself. Still the best foundation for law is the consensus of the largest majority, and the best preparation for good law is universal education of the people. If the educated desire better laws—those more suited to them—there is one sovereign way, and that is to lift the majority to their heights, and then the laws will not only be abstractly right, but practically right.

Our own history has examples of these things more than I can venture to comment upon. To us now it seems as if the Revolution of blessed memory was nearly unanimous, and yet there were Tories, and it has been whispered that they were really in the majority, but the vehement patriots counted for more than they were by reason of stress. But that struggle was terminated by success, and that question settled itself with only the fluctuations of eight years.

This generation has seen not a few of these radical changes, and ought to have a fair judgment on the subject. In our history it has sometimes happened that a great victory was a great defeat. When Mr. Franklin Pierce was chosen President it was by a majority hitherto unknown in our experience. It was then thought that the question of slavery was settled. But it proved that the vehemence of the few had done its work, and that the conscience and intelligence of the many were to have their way, although long years and a frightful war had to intervene.

In 1872 General Grant was chosen President by a vote which surpassed the vote by which Franklin Pierce was triumphant over General Scott and the Whigs of 1852. It seemed to be a victory which placed the Republicans in power with a new lease of life longer than the old one. It was really, however, only a triumph of law and order and the use and wont of this world

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over possible anarchy, disorder, and the unknown. Horace Greeley is always to be revered as the great editor whose mistakes were swallowed up in the great daily service he rendered to humanity and freedom, but the combination between him and his lifelong enemies might, people then thought, produce some dread monstrosity which this country could never endure. Perhaps too great a reliance on this victory had as much to do with the election of 1874 as the struggles of the South to secure a white man's government. That the election of 1874, which changed the House of Representatives from ninety-nine Republican majority to forty-five Democratic was not a real victory expressive of the permanent wishes of the people, is proved by the election of Mr. Hayes over Mr. Tilden, who, whether correctly or incorrectly, was deemed to be a much safer man than his party.

This brings us down to the three last victories of 1890, 1892, and the present year of our Lord. What indications do they give of the sentiments of the people?

The election of the year 1890 was peculiar. It happened under circumstances which have not been well understood, and are perhaps well worth describing. The election in Maine came off in September, and instead of being any indication of the final outcome, as it usually is, it resulted in the re-election of all the Republican members by hitherto unexampled majorities. The tariff act, however, had not been passed, though its nature had been pretty well indicated. That bill, which was passed by the House in May ought to have been enacted, and both Houses ought to have adjourned, by the middle of July. But the bill was delayed in the Senate by the opposition for the better supervision of elections, and did not pass until October, about a month before the election. Of course, there was not the slightest chance to explain its provisions to the people. Truth was absolutely crushed to earth. All the false statements which had been made against the bill had no chance of refutation after its enactment. Before a bill is enacted, especially a tariff bill, it can be attacked, but never defended. Until a tariff goes into actual operation, all the things can be urged against it which the human imagination can conceive; and the human imagination is exceedingly prolific during a heated campaign.

This condition of things was in itself fatal odds, but was the least of our troubles. After the bill passed the House, most of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mercantile world thought it would be the tariff act, and began to import on that basis. The result was that the importers, jobbers, wholesalers, and retailers were well stocked up; and when the Senate began to amend, every ship beckoned the merchant to make more importations. So it went on up to the time when the bill finally passed. Under ordinary circumstances this would not have made trouble, but, underneath, the whole mercantile situation at that time was a quicksand, which then began to give signs of sinking. The influences which brought down the great house of Barings was then at work, and money became scarce. Men who had imported largely began to find that money—immediate money—was more imperative than distant profits. Hence the commercial travellers were sent forth at once and with urgent orders to sell. Now, if you wish to have a man buy to-day instead of to-morrow, you must tell him why. As the result, every retailer's window was full of inducements to buy, founded on the rise to be caused by the new bill. The rise never came in most cases, but everybody believed it would, and the retailer, once started on the path, put up the future prices of all his goods, even if the McKinley Bill had lowered the "tariff taxes" on them. It followed then, as night follows day, that we found a hundred counters talking against one stump. Every woman who went to a store and tried to buy went home to complain, and a wild unrest filled the public mind. The wonder is that we got any votes at all.

In 1892 we had the remains of our great defeat of 1890 to contend with. We suffered from the most elaborate gerrymanders which ever adorned the history of this country. We had also to meet that unrest which comes slowly with too uniform prosperity, just as it comes quickly with disaster. Discontent will always come to the human race. It often leads to suffering and misery, often leads from wealth to poverty, from prosperity to want; but on the whole it is the mother of progress, and the assurance of a better future. In that conflict the Democratic party had the advantage of its bad character; nobody for a moment believed that it meant its platform, not even to the diminished extent of the late Wilson Bill. It was well understood that Mr. Cleveland favored the rejected plank, which was a near approach to Republican ideas; and as Mr. Cleveland was then the real platform, judicious Republican orators did not venture to predict radical changes. Hence Mr. Cleveland was elected, and with him a Democratic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senate and a Democratic House. Hardly had Mr. Cleveland taken his oath of office when the people began to have a realizing sense that things which are done are different from things which are proposed. No plans ever quite show what a house will be after it is built. Then came the proceedings of the extra session of Congress, and the people saw what a house they had really built, and that even with Mr. Cleveland as the chief corner-stone it would not do to live in.

I need not rehearse the story of the elections of 1893. In all the States where there are real elections the voice of the people sounded far above all party tocsins and gave what would have been full warning to men of sense and judgment. Unhappily for this country the party in power was under control of those whom elections did not affect, and the work went on regardless of the popular will. In a real republic, where the will of the people is really recorded as expressed, there can be no tyranny. Our forefathers used to say that where annual elections leave off, tyranny begins. Surely even in these degenerate days we may say that where the control of the machinery of government is in the hands of men who are not subject to popular will in free and fair elections, tyranny has already begun. No wonder such men repealed all election laws and sought to sanction their own existence by prolonging the possibilities of their kind. But wrong is never so weak as in its hour of triumph. The very repeal of all the safeguards thrown around the ballot-box will awaken the public attention and stir the public heart. Already the Atlanta *Constitution* is exposing the frauds in its own State of Georgia, one of the most thrifty of the Southern States, where least of all fraudulent elections can be justified by the fear of negro domination. If the partisans in Tennessee should cheat Henry Clay Evans out of his gubernatorial chair so fairly won, that nefarious success will be but the beginning of ruin. No republic can be based on fraud. This is beginning to be seen even in those States where bringing the will of the voter to naught has become a system. At the signs of a change to honest elections all good men rejoice.

The warning which was given by the elections in the East and West, the elections of 1893, though they included all the great States,—those heretofore Democratic as well as those who had voted the Republican ticket in 1892,—was not in the least heeded.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drunk with the victory of 1892 and out of touch with the real people of the country, the leaders of the party in power went on in the House of Representatives to lay up wrath against the day of wrath. Into details it is not worth while to go. That would be to dig up the buried where it is only needful to point to their last resting-place. The Senate, which had only a small majority under the leadership of the Senators from Maryland, Ohio, and New Jersey, while it did not exhibit too much sense, certainly showed a striking and a valuable contrast to the Executive and the House and probably saved their party from annihilation. This, however, was largely due to the people who made themselves heard there when they had failed in the popular branch.

Then came the elections of last November, so overwhelming and so crushing that they seem to have settled the future of this country for many years.

It would not be wonderful if many men were now asking themselves why it was necessary for this country to undergo so many misfortunes to learn to let well enough alone. The answer is to be found in the nature of the human race as disclosed in the history of the world. Government must express not the opinions of the lowest or of the highest, but the average of all. The vigor of the few may be triumphant for a while, but the ultimate result is the prevalence of the settled opinions of all. To arrive at that we may have to try the bad in order to appreciate the good. When Cromwell and his followers saw the light of liberty, it had not reached the great mass of the people and they had to have Charles the Second to make clear to them that the divine right of all was better than the divine right of any one. So, perhaps, in order to appreciate Republican principles, it was needful to have Hawaii and a "firm foreign policy," Wilson bills and years of disaster. Perhaps, too, the Republican rule of the coming years may improve on the Republican rule of the past as did the England of 1688 upon the England of Cromwell, for we may learn, as did the freemen of that day, something from the conquered enemy.

THOMAS B. REED.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

ARE WE ALL DESCENDANTS OF THE CONQUEROR?

In the December number of the REVIEW Judge Walter Clark offers consolation to all disposed to envy those persons who take a pride in claiming descent from some royal progenitor. Calling arithmetic to his aid, he endeavors to prove that not only these claimants to princely blood, but all of us alike, prince or peasant, archbishop or burglar, are descended from William the Conqueror, Charlemagne, Alfred the Great, or any other monarch of those remote times we choose to fix upon. He shows that if we grant—as of course we must, in order to account for the increase of the earth's population—that each married couple is represented in the next generation by something more than a couple, the number of the descendants of one couple after twenty-six generations may be surprisingly large. It is sufficient to allow a very small ratio of increase in order to prove that William the Conqueror may be the ancestor of the entire English speaking people of the present day. And, conversely, he asserts that every individual in that people, being as he aptly expresses it, the apex of an inverted pyramid, must admit the probability of his descent, not only from the Conqueror, but from every highwayman, cut-throat, and burglar of the eleventh century.

To those who would feel horrified at having this latter ancestry thrust on them, and, on the other hand, to those who would not be at all grateful to Judge Clark for proving their descent from William the Conqueror—who was himself only a sort of master-highwayman or master-cut-throat—I will offer some considerations which may show that there is a weak spot in Judge Clark's argument.

There is one requisite for the acceptance of his argument which Judge Clark either overlooks or unjustifiably takes for granted. For the validity of his theory an intermingling of royal and plebeian blood is necessary. Now this is just the point at which those who lay claim to royal descent believe that their superiority over plebeians lies. The advantage claimed for noble origin depends on the belief that noble families kept themselves throughout their history quite apart from the common folk; that if ever intermarriage occurred it was only at rare intervals, and that the taint thus introduced was in time dissipated over such a wide area that in the course of a few generations the fraction of it transmitted to any one individual was infinitesimal. Now there is nothing irrational in believing that in the same country two classes of the community have during their history kept distinct. Suppose an extreme case, which, after all, is only an exaggeration of what may actually have occurred. Each of William the Conqueror's grand-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

children derived a quarter of his inheritable qualities from each of his four grandparents, and, consequently, a quarter of them from the Conqueror. Now let us suppose that these grandchildren had all intermarried with each other, and that their children and descendants had continued to marry exclusively with each other; then every descendant, no matter how remote, would have to refer one-quarter of his inheritable qualities ultimately to the Conqueror. Here there would be no dissipation of the strain, and whatever virtue may be supposed to lie in royal Norman blood might legitimately be claimed by any member of the family.

Claimants to noble or royal descent can argue that a process similar to this, only, of course, not so exclusive, actually did take place. Princes and nobles of the eleventh and succeeding centuries, they might say, did not intermarry with the common people. Their own class was always large enough to supply them with wives. An occasional *mésalliance*, of course, introduced now and then an infusion of plebeian blood, which would be of some consequence to the immediate descendants of such a marriage; but unless such an occurrence were constantly repeated, it would, after a few generations, be quite insignificant. In the same way, when a duke's daughter, for example, married the coachman, and she and her descendants were repudiated by the class from which she had sprung, the microscopic particle of noble blood to be found in one of her remote descendants would be very slight excuse for pretensions to nobility, and here Judge Clark's arguments would have force. But such spurious pretensions as this do not affect the claims of the genuine stock.

Thus we see that there is after all some ground for the belief in the significance of noble birth, if heredity counts for anything. In countries where there has always been a sharp line of demarcation between patricians and plebeians, the claim of any member of either class to his share of the virtues of his class is perfectly legitimate. Those of us who do not pretend to royal origin can at any rate claim one important advantage. Among common folk the ne'er-do-weel and the criminal are likely to find it difficult to marry, so that their breed has not the same chance of being propagated as that of the honest and intelligent. But we have never yet heard that immorality or lack of brains in a prince was found an insuperable obstacle to his marriage.

GEORGE CLARKE.

THE IDEAL FREE PUBLIC LIBRARY BUILDING.

WHEN one intends to build a house in which he and his family expect to live, before even an architect is consulted, many an evening is spent in laying out on paper those features which, by both the man and his wife, are deemed necessary. It is no doubt true that these very essentials, or some of them at least, finally give way before the suggestions of the architect. The fact remains, however, that those most interested in the house have given much thought to the matter, and, when finally seeking expert assistance, are able to give their architect certain features which to them seem to be necessary to their comfort and to the needs of housekeeping. In contrast to this care and thought, one has but to turn to the average public building erected and paid for by the municipality. Such a building, as a rule, bears no evidence that its needs and purposes have received any proper consideration from those having charge of its construction. Indeed,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a very large number of such buildings testify to the undoubted fact that the outside has been the one problem considered, the inside details being left to develop themselves. There are no public buildings of which this criticism is truer than it is of public libraries, whether built by private munificence or at the expense of the municipality. Few public library buildings are to any extent fitted to their purposes or adapted to the best uses of the public. There is no intention here of suggesting that architectural effect should be lost sight of. On the contrary, the writer is an earnest enthusiast for the much needed reform in the architecture of public buildings. He does, however, wish to be understood as insisting that the uses to which any building is to be put, not alone for the present, but for the future as well, should be well thought out, and its interior carefully planned and determined on, before the problem of erecting its shell, or outside covering, is even considered.

In many libraries the public, their owners, are shut out from the use of a large part of the building by reason of the needlessly large space given over to the mere storing of the books. In a library with which the writer is somewhat familiar, seven-eighths of the floor area was, until recently, taken up by the book shelves and administration, only one-eighth being devoted to the uses of the reading public. One fundamental rule of library construction on which the writer of these lines would insist, is that as small a space as possible should be set aside for the housing of the books and for the purpose of administration, due regard, of course, being given to the natural increase, not only in the number of books, but in their users as well. As, however, the arrangement of the book-room and the question of administration cannot well be discussed without becoming technical, and, as the purpose of this article is to consider the library from the standpoint of the public, rather than from that of the librarian, it may be as well to proceed at once to those points in which the reading public will take the greater interest.

There are not a few public libraries in the country in which the museum idea has been engrafted on that of the library. This is a distinct error, unless, as happens in a few libraries, the room set apart for a museum, or art gallery, is separated from the library proper. It may be seen at a glance that having one room serve the double purpose of reading room and museum must prove to be a fatal mistake; for the reader should not have his quiet intruded upon by the museum visitor, who, if he be not alone, will wish, and rightfully too, to talk with his companion as to the articles of interest which he has been invited to examine. These two uses are as incompatible as would be a room used jointly for study and for music. As a rule of construction, it may be said that any town or city which supports a free public library should provide these three essentials: First, a room where those who are simply waiting for books may talk freely but quietly. This should be so located that the coming and going of the book-borrowers should not interfere with the book readers in other parts of the building. Second, a reading-room, well lighted, and both airy and cheerful, within which the reader should find newspapers, magazines, and periodicals ready at hand. In large libraries a separate room might well be set aside for newspapers alone. Third, a room for the student, where should be found such reference books as the library contains, to which books the reader should have unhindered access. This room should serve as the public's study; the quietness of which should never be disturbed. These three features are essential in every library. Added to them, the ideal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public library building, the consideration of which these lines have in mind, should contain another room devoted to the use of children, in which—if the trustees have been fortunate in securing the right woman as an attendant—work may be done which, in its far-reaching and beneficial effects, will be second to none accomplished in any part of the library. In this room will be formed an early taste for reading, and, if tact, patience, and kindly nature have been used, the child will, when graduating therefrom, carry with him to the main library that sense of the proper use of books as to make that use, not only of greater benefit to himself, but to all others with whom he comes in contact. This thought is by no means visionary or Utopian. Those familiar with what is being done by librarians can easily name a number of libraries in which such work is being most successfully carried on. This room may well serve a twofold purpose. Being used by the children during certain hours of the day, it might be devoted at certain other hours to such work as may be suggested through a close and hearty co-operation between the librarian and the superintendent of the town's schools. To this room a teacher in the high-school might very properly be permitted to take his class, that its members should together have the privilege of studying such books of reference as relate to some given subject.

Still another room may well be provided, the necessity for which is perhaps rarely considered, but which is called for by an existing condition too often ignored. The poorer element of a community, as if by instinct, shrinks from availing itself of privileges, if doing so necessitates the use of rooms designed and furnished in a way to which its members are not accustomed. This condition applies forcibly to the man who, never having used the library, or given any thought to the question of reading, is approached by the librarian with the view of making him a user of the books under his charge. This man will be sure to feel that the very atmosphere of the library, its reading-room and its alcoves for study, are unfitted to him, and he will not be willing to make the effort to adjust himself to such conditions.

For this class of the community—which, of course, does not include those of its members who have already acquired the taste for reading—a room may well be reserved, to supply the place of the village reading-room, which has been, in so very many towns, successfully introduced. It would not be long before many of its users would wish to graduate thence to the rooms above, where they might find the books better fitted to their changed conditions. The ideal library—if, indeed, it is to justify its name of free public library—should include all of these means of usefulness. It should avoid everything spectacular. Its every foot of space should be made use of to inculcate a love of reading and to provide pleasant, cheerful rooms adapted to the uses of its many frequenters. Its construction should receive the careful and earnest thought of those to whom the citizens have intrusted it. Such a building will surely prove to be, in the hands of progressive trustees and an earnest librarian, a power in the community for doing good, the extent of which can not be measured.

E. C. HOVEY.

WORKING-CLASS TENEMENTS IN LONDON.

LONDON, it may now be fairly claimed, is in a position to give other large cities a few points concerning the tenement problem. It would be remarkable if it were not so; for in one way or another the problem of adequately and decently housing the industrial classes in the English

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

metropolis has been grappled with since 1840. During the fifty years which have intervened since the first movement was made, the question has engaged the serious and constant attention of a number of eminently practical social reformers, men and women; and on several occasions, in more recent years, Parliament has taken it in hand, and, by means of legislation conferring new and large powers on the municipal authorities, has contributed its share to the solution of the problem.

Much had been accomplished by associated effort before Parliament took any action. Associated effort, working on social and philanthropic, as distinct from charitable lines, had accomplished the pioneer work and shown what could be done, long before the movement received any help from the legislature. It was, in fact, not until 1875 that this help came. By that time three great organizations, adequately backed with capital, were engaged in providing accommodation for the working classes, and numerous monuments to the success and usefulness of these organizations, in the shape of great blocks of dwellings, were then in existence, especially in central London, where the problem of housing artisans and laborers in good and cheap homes, convenient to their work, was and always had been most pressing. The pioneer organization had at this time been in existence over thirty years. The other two, although working on a larger scale, were much newer to the work; but even these organizations had had twelve or thirteen years' experience of the work before their operations were facilitated and immensely extended by the measures adopted by Parliament in the seventies, with a view to preventing the industrial classes from being crowded out of central London, and compelled to make their homes in the suburbs.

The organizations then at work were the Metropolitan Association for Improving the Dwellings of the Industrious Classes, the Improved Dwellings Company, now known to Londoners as the Waterlow Company, and the Peabody Trustees. The Metropolitan Association was the pioneer in the work. It was organized in 1844, and was the outcome of a movement started by a late Rector of the East End parish of Spitalfields. Its first venture was a five-story block near St. Pancras station, built in 1846, and affording accommodation for 110 families. This was the first building of its kind in London. The Improved Dwellings Company was organized in 1863. Sir Sidney Waterlow was the pioneer of this concern, and is its president at the present time. He organized the company after achieving success with two or three blocks of dwellings built in Finsbury as a private speculation. The Peabody Trust, charged with the administration of the Peabody fund, came into existence about the same time; and these two organizations have now between them provided dwelling accommodation for more than 50,000 people, involving an aggregate expenditure of two and a quarter millions sterling. By the end of 1893, the pioneer company had provided dwelling accommodation for 6,500 people; the Peabody Trustees had provided 5,070 separate dwellings, accommodating nearly 20,000 people; while the Waterlow Company, in its own buildings and in buildings under its management, had provided 6,120 dwellings, with accommodation for 31,000 people.

Until about 1877 each of these three corporations worked on its own lines without any recognition or help from the municipal authorities, or from Parliament. The Metropolitan Association and the Waterlow Company were dividend earning concerns, differing from other commercial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

undertakings only in that their charters limited their dividends to five per cent. Both companies had always disclaimed any charitable intentions. Their promoters and their original shareholders were mostly people interested in social reforms, and also in philanthropic work; but not in any schemes for providing working people with house accommodation at less than cost. The originators of both companies believed that working class Londoners paid too high rents for the poor accommodation which was available for them; that it was possible to provide them with better and more convenient dwellings; and, at the same time, secure from the improved dwellings in rent adequate compensation for the capitalist. It was, from the first, the aim of the directors to earn five per cent. for distribution among the shareholders, and in most years this result has been achieved. The Peabody Trustees, on the other hand, when they commenced their work, were in possession of the late Mr. Peabody's magnificent gifts, and in accordance with the term. of the gifts were limited to making three per cent. on the outlays on buildings, and were pledged to use the returns so made in the extension of their work.

All three organizations adopted much the same general plan. The earlier buildings of the Peabody Trustees are remarkable for their fort-like solidity, which gives almost an appearance of grimness. There is little outwardly to distinguish the more recent buildings of the three associations. They are mostly blocks of five and six floors, divided off into self-contained dwellings of two, three, four, and five rooms. In the Peabody Buildings, however, there are some 800 one-roomed dwellings. The Metropolitan Association and the Waterlow Company, after some experience of these one-roomed dwellings, eliminated them from their plan of work. Internally the differences in the dwelling blocks are not very material, The Peabody Trustees provide laundries and drying rooms, and in some buildings baths and reading-rooms, for the tenants in common; while the passages, stairways, and courtyards are the only parts common to the tenants of the two dividend earning companies. The policy of the directors of these companies is to make each dwelling as nearly self-contained as possible. This is especially so with the Waterlow Company, whose experience is that London workpeople will willingly pay a higher rent for privacy, and for rooms and domestic offices of which they have the exclusive possession and use.

Nor is there much difference in the class of tenants. The two dividend earning companies draw theirs from the ranks of artisans and clerks. The Peabody buildings are largely occupied by the same classes, with, however, an admixture of day laborers. Rents, taken room by room, are but fractionally lower in the Peabody than in the dwellings of the other companies. In the Waterlow buildings the average rent per room is two shillings and twopence. In the Peabody buildings it is two shillings and a penny three farthings, and the average rent per family is four shillings and ninepence farthing. The Peabody Trustees, however, make it a rule to give preference to men who are earning not more than thirty shillings a week. The other companies do not question prospective tenants as to their weekly earnings. All that they are careful about is that a tenant's family is not too large for the tenement he desires to occupy, that he is in regular employment, and can produce a certificate as to character from his employer, and finally that he is a man who will pay his rent. A certificate to this effect must be produced from his last landlord. In Central London there is always a great demand for the tenements, and artisans and laboring men to whom near-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness to work is of first importance will readily comply with these and the other conditions imposed. None of the corporations permit any arrears of rent. They have always held that it is no charity to allow a man to get into arrears. Prompt payment, a week in advance, is insisted upon, and if a tenant cannot comply with this condition, he must make room for one who will.

The legislation under which the work of the improved dwellings associations has been so greatly facilitated and extended, dates from the Artizans and Workmen's Dwellings Act of 1875, and from another Act passed in 1877 which, in the matter of London public improvements, gave great power to the Metropolitan Board of Works, the predecssor of the London County Council, and brought the municipal authorities of London into contact with the dwellings associations. Up to this time the associations had bought their sites in the open market. When, however, the legislation of 1875 and 1877 came into effect, greatly improved opportunities for acquiring sites were offered them. The Act of 1877 empowered the Metropolitan Board of Works to make wholesale clearances, in order to widen throughfares, or construct new ones. But along with these powers went the obligation that, in making these clearances, the Board of Works should not permanently displace the working classes who were in occupation of the buildings which were pulled down. The Board was not authorized to erect and maintain dwellings; but only to engage with bodies of trustees, or societies to carry such schemes into effect upon such terms as the Board might think expedient.

The Board purchased the property to be pulled down at a fair valuation; but when the clear ground was offered for sale, a certain portion of it was sold subject to the condition that workmen's dwellings should be erected upon it. Little more than one-third the normal value was obtained for the land so sold, and nearly all of it passed into the possession of the Waterlow Company, the Peabody Trustees, the Metropolitan Association, and other kindred and well-accredited associations which had been subsequently founded for building workmen's dwellings. All these associations were extremely busy during the next ten years, and during this time the number of separate dwellings, owned by the Peabody Trust, increased from 2,348, accommodating 9,860 people in 1878, to 4,359 dwellings accommodating 18,000 in 1884. During this period the Waterlow Company was equally busy, and both it and the Peabody Trust outran their capital, and received large advances at very low rates of interest from the State through the Public Works Loan Commissioners.

In recent years the obligation to build workmen's dwellings on sites cleared for public improvements in London, has been somewhat modified; but the principle that working people are not to be displaced without room being found for them in new buildings somewhere in the same neighborhood is still in force. It applies not only to improvements undertaken by the municipal authorities, but also to work carried out by the railway companies. If a railway company, in building a new terminus, or in making an extension of its lines, demolishes a number of dwellings occupied by the working classes, it is compelled to find accommodation for people of the same class to an extent which shall be regarded as satisfactory by the Home Office.

By the adoption of this principle by Parliament, and by the public spirited action of the dwellings corporations, house accommodation for at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

least seventy thousand people has been provided in Central London. If the improved dwellings in the outskirts are taken into account the number is much larger; but it is safe to say that in the more crowded parts of London seventy thousand are now in homes which have been built as a result of the movement, inaugurated in 1844, by the Metropolitan Association for Improving the Dwellings of the Industrious Classes.

EDWARD PORRITT.

THE LOVE OF SCANDAL.

WHO does not remember the greed of the Athenians for news? The love of gossip was one of their most striking characteristics, and "What news?" was as much part of the business of the Agora, when friends met each other at noon, as the "price of fresh fish" or the "condition of the flower girls' violets."

No event was too trivial for them to chronicle, no shifting of life's kaleidoscope too minute for them to follow—nothing, in fact, in public or private, seemed to escape their scrutiny.

Maid, matron, and heteira, statesman and slave, the favorite poet's latest ode, the fashionable sophist's last oration, what blunder of uncouth simplicity the newest importation from Sparta had committed;—of all things under heaven they discoursed freely, discussing and dissecting without restraint, without stint, as no people have done before or since.

They were the lovers of gossip *par excellence*, and Athens was the paradise of all newsmongers of the time; for neither dramatist nor orator could get a hearing if any should raise the cry, "News! news!" "News from the Hesperides!" "News from the Cassiterides!" "News of Glaucus!" "News of Phyrne!" "Who will hear my news?"

But even the Athenians had their limits, and knew when to forbear; the line of gossip had to be drawn somewhere, if they would not be like their own harpies, ravening and befouling all things; and they drew it at the door of the tomb. The dead were as sacred to them as the gods, Hades as impenetrable as Olympus; for much latent delicacy underlay this sunny old-world love of gossip, this chattering, laughing, effervescent delight in personal details.

Yes, although the Athenians were "heathens," in the common acceptance of the term nowadays, they respected the memory of their dead, and we do not. Their qualities of human pity and honor, their sense of fairness, even as man to man, came into play when there was no one present to reply, for they felt that the ghost wandering mournfully in the pale world of shades had still susceptibilities and affections; his wishes were to be carried out as honorably as if he still had power to enforce them; so, too, his weaknesses were to be as lightly touched upon as if he were to be met half an hour hence to discuss with his biographer what had been said of him.

No friend would ever have said, of the dead he had loved and lived with, words which it would have been dishonorable to say to the living, for the same cause as that which makes it impossible for a high-minded gentleman to speak ill of the absent who are unable to defend themselves.

The very helplessness of the dead was their safeguard against indiscretion, as against slander, and "*de mortuis nil nisi bonum*" only expressed the general respect for that helplessness.

But we have changed all that "old-time" honor, all that bygone loyalty of reticence.

We have gone in now for a coarse and cruel chatter which we call eu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

phemistically "candor," but which is in reality nothing but love of scandal, carried to the highest point of indecency.

Now it is the irrepressible interviewer, who lurks in the shadow of the sick-chamber and photographs the details of the death-bed with revolting minuteness; the various stages of disease (it may be) are reported *in extenso*, and surgical and pathological facts flood the magazines and newspapers.

Death is the signal for prying into all corners, publishing every secret, giving forth to the world the most careless as well as the most confidential letters, which no doubt had been dashed off in a moment of unreflecting expansion. Had the deceased committed what the world calls an "indiscretion," the women and children are exhibited in the pages of the memorialist as one exhibits wax figures at a show, and the love which he had cherished in secret and, may be, repented of in agony is beaten out into so many paragraphs of prurient sensationalism, with more hinted at probably than is safe or decent to detail.

Had he an unjust suspicion of men, such as is often the accompaniment of an overworked brain and a diseased body, the expressions used by him on such occasions are scattered abroad, even though a better mind withdrew them before death and there was a full and free reconciliation all round.

Rien n'est sacré pour un sapeur, and nothing is sacred to a biographer of that lower type, in whom the instinct of the jackal and hyena meet.

His articles are written in the tears and blood of his dead friend; but what of that? It gives him both money and renown, and he would have us believe that if he did not positively create the genius which took the generation by storm, or held it breathless in delight, which created a new era in literature or opened a new pathway for science, for statesmanship, or for art, he at least educated, directed, coached, and inspired it. If these are some of the penalties which the illustrious dead have to suffer at the hands of their friends, they fare still worse at the hands of mere acquaintances.

Quem ad finem effrenata audacia jactabit se? Crowds of these men start up like gnats in the evening, round the grave and claim, as their beloved intimate, him who lies dumb and powerless within: him with whom when living they never had more than the most passing, the most superficial intercourse, and would never have been admitted to more. Fancy conversations spreading over all sorts of important topics are reported as having taken place between them; conversations of the gravest moment built on the slender foundations of a passing half-hour's chat; and the most sensitive and reticent of men is suddenly exhibited as a gushing babbler, who gave his confidence unhesitatingly to a chance companion, with neither claim nor merit for such distinction.

Nothing can be in worse taste than all this wretched half-scandalous, half-indelicate gossip. Just as a photograph, where the light has been unskilfully managed, is not like a person because out of drawing and due relation, so the most absolutely exact facts may give a false impression because taken without the context and surroundings belonging to them.

It is not anatomy—it is mutilation and distortion. But it is the fashion nowadays to extol Boswell without understanding him and to justify a bad copy by worth of the original.

OLIVER S. JONES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ITALIAN WOMEN OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

It sounds idle and pedantic to tell the reader that history, ancient and modern, contains tales of crime and sorrow such as cannot be equalled in fiction. No matter if it is the magic pen of Byron which lifts the human body to such heights of poetical splendor that the dazzled eye cannot distinguish right from wrong; or if the writer indulging in the coarser realism of the present age, tries to describe what is actually crawling in the gutter; history is *always* more dramatic!

The women of the fifteenth century in Italy were powerful, and many heroic deeds, as well as many tragedies, of that period can be traced to them. They were reckless, passionate, and lovely! The high born were scholars well trained in Latin, able to discuss philosophical questions and appreciate poetry and the works of art that made Italy the marvel of the world. They were accomplished sportswomen, who besides living, so to say, half their lives on horseback, kept racing horses, which ran and won, bearing their colors, many a prize in the peculiar races, Palio, which still take place in our day in the oldest towns of Italy like Padova and Siena. Those women were haughty, but the requests of the poor reached them in their palaces and were granted. All this we can learn from letters and documents relating to Parisina, which exist in the *Archivio di Stato*, of Modena; and as Byron dwells on her guilt and her death, so do these letters and documents speak of her life, which was too short, although bright and sunny, like that of a beautiful butterfly.

In the year 1418, Nicolo III. of Este, reigning Marquis of Ferrara, took for his second wife Parisina, daughter of Andrea Malatesta, ruler of Cesena, and Lucrezia Degli Ordelaffi, of Forli. Of noble blood, Parisina was only fifteen years old when she married a man many years her senior, who had grown old in the never-ceasing wars of that troubled age, and in the political intrigues that were almost as fierce and unrelenting as war. On entering her new home the young bride found no less than eight illegitimate children of Marquis Nicolo living in the palace with almost as much distinction and honor as if they were his children by marriage. Their mother, Stella dei Tolomei, was living; but strange to say, it was to the care of the young Marchioness that these children were intrusted. The eldest, Ugo, was only fourteen, but he was already celebrated for his beauty, goodness, and bravery. He was his father's pet, but at first was not a favorite with Parisina, whom he disliked so openly that many contemporaries speak of his undisguised hatred for her. But she was of mild heart, young and lovely, her husband being too busy in his schemes and battles to value her refinement and her high-bred charm. We see her taking much interest in her husband's children, giving written orders for their clothes, and providing for their tutors, of whom each child had two besides a retinue of servants. So loose were the morals of the age that neither Parisina nor those about her thought Marquis Nicolo a profligate, and only wondered that he, who tried to waylay every beautiful woman who came across his adventurous path, had made a law by which adultery was punished with death.

After one year of wedded life Parisina became the mother of twins, and she herself announced the happy event to her subjects, in a quaint letter half Latin and half Italian, published with many other letters of hers in the *Nouva Antologia*, of July, 1893. She was a queen in her domains, Marquis Nicolo being sovereign of Ferrara, Reggio, Parma, and several other cities

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and territories; and we see that she had twelve ladies-in-waiting (*donzelle*) and six maids (*massare*), who were paid by her and clothed and fed at her expense. She had a great liking for a beautiful villa called Belfiore, which she had furnished with a comfort unknown at that time, while her magnificent but grim castle of Ferrara, containing one hundred and sixteen rooms, was devoid of any furniture, except what was strictly necessary for every-day use. Belfiore and Fossadalbero, both not far distant from Ferrara, were the two places where the Marchioness, with her Court, used to spend summer and autumn reading novels, listening to troubadours, feeding birds of prey trained for a cruel sport, and playing the harp, which, when her twins were hardly five years old, she began teaching them on tiny instruments especially provided for them. Between the time she spent in the country and the months during which she resided in state in her castle of Ferrara, came several journeys: one to Venice in 1422, and another to Padova in the following year—this one a pilgrimage to the Church of the Holy Anthony, for whom she had special devotion.

At this time Parisina was without blemish, and her pursuits, among which charity had a large part, might have been sufficient to fill her life, if an evil spirit had not prompted her husband to try and dispel the enmity that existed between her and his favorite son. To that purpose he brought them together as much as possible; in the country where Ugo also played the harp, and where he on horseback escorted the Marchioness in her chariot, and on her journeys, never devoid of dangers, where Ugo had the care of her safety. When and where did the two who had hated each other begin to love unto death? History has no answer to this question, but we see Parisina suddenly anxious to please her stepson and humor his whims; ordering for him rich clothes, horses, saddles, and weapons of great price. The love which succeeded to hatred certainly lasted some time unsuspected, till the culprits grew bold through impunity, or were obliged to take some one into their confidence; and so it happened that Ugo confided his secret to Rangoni, his follower, and the Marchioness could not hide her guilt from the prying eyes of one of her ladies. She had been kind to her, as she was to almost every one, and had given her on her wedding day a costly outfit, every item of which she had ordered herself. We have the bill and description of the chest, inlaid with gold and painted by a well-known artist, in which furs, linen, jewels, and dresses were inclosed and sent as the gift of her noble mistress to the woman who betrayed her. It seems, according to tradition, that a man by the name of Jovese, who was in high favor with the Marquis and his wife, on crossing the private apartments of the Marchioness, met his daughter, the lady-in-waiting above mentioned, crying bitterly. She told him that the Marchioness had struck her, adding that the latter should beware because she knew all her secrets; and on being closely questioned she told her father all that she knew.

Jovese was devoted to Nicolo, having been his confidential servant and adviser for years, and could, therefore, speak to him openly, even on such a subject. The chronicle says (for here history is dumb) that grief was at first stronger in Nicolo than his thirst for revenge, for he felt that this one blow deprived him of all he loved. He did not act rashly, but had the lovers watched, and he watched them himself until their guilt was proved beyond doubt. Then the two were taken to the Tower called *Dei Leoni*, during the night of March 20, in the year 1425. This was their final parting, for never

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

did the two meet again on earth, each having a separate prison in the dreadful dungeon which had witnessed so many black deeds. As soon as the astounding news became public, friends and counsellors of the Marquis implored to be granted a hearing, and speaking of the stain that would be left on the name of Este by the death of the two sinners, and pleading their extreme youth, tried to soften his heart. But Nicolo was stabbed to the quick by the treason, and neither the fear of dishonor nor the publicity thus given to the offence detained him from applying the law, which, with ominous foresight, he had provided for his own revenge. So he ordered that his son and his wife and Aldobrandino Rangoni, Ugo's follower, should be beheaded that same night. The block was carried to the dungeon on the night of March 21, and Ugo was the first to be taken from the prison, his beautiful head falling under the sword of the executioner.

Parisina spent the day in her cell in darkness and despair. Guilty as she was, will not those dreadful hours be reckoned as an atonement? She, too, was taken from her prison, advancing reluctantly, almost carried by her executioners, asking piteously at every step the dreadful question—if it was there. Evidently she believed her death would be even more cruel. She thought herself destined to disappear in one of those pitfalls (*trabochelli*) so common in the castles and prisons of that time, where a poor wretch, broken in soul and body, buried alive, would suffer unspeakable torture and die a lingering death. No one had Christian charity enough to spare her that agony; and when, finally, she reached her destination, she trembled only because she saw the block covered with blood. Whose blood was that? Then she asked if Ugo was alive; and when the answer came that he was dead, she said proudly, "Nor do I wish to live now." She divested herself of the ornaments that still adorned her, and, crying bitterly, covered her head and knelt where her beloved had knelt, and put her bare neck on the block where his neck had rested, and which was soaked with his blood. While her lovely head was severed from her body, Marquis Nicolo was raving in his frenzy waiting for the dreadful news, and the two innocent children slept peacefully dreaming of the mother who to them was nothing but purity and love. It seems that when his fury was spent, the Marquis repented of the sentence he had passed on his son, and inquired, with pale lips, if he was still alive? But being answered in the negative, he again began his ravings, saying to the captain of the castle to kill him, too, since he had killed his son. He never expressed any sorrow or remorse for the punishment inflicted on his young wife, nor after some time did he show any sign of suffering, but continued his pursuits of war and politics, as if his hands had never been dipped in blood. A cruel deed, which ought to reconcile the reader to the present age and mild customs of our time, but which leaves the Christian in much doubt and perplexity.

Which of these three sinners deserved pardon, and which of them will have found mercy at the hands of the Almighty?

CEREA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED